

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

(698)

UNITED STATES OF AMERIC



FEB 17 LUUD

ALTON COLES, et al.

Defendants.

Criminal Action 2:05-cr-00440-RBS-1

Philadelphia, PA January 16, 2008

TRANSCRIPT OF OPENING STATEMENTS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE R. BARCLAY SURRICK
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

v.

For the Government:

MICHAEL J. BRESNICK, ESQUIRE RICHARD A. LLORET, ESQUIRE U.S. Attorney's Office 615 Chestnut Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

For the Defendant Alton Coles:

CHRISTOPHER D. WARREN, ESQUIRE Law Office of Christopher Warren 1500 Walnut Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

For the Defendant Timothy Baukman:

JACK J. McMAHON, JR., ESQUIRE Law Office of Jack McMahon 1500 Walnut Street, Suite 900 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

For the Defendant Monique Pullins:

LAURENCE HARMELIN, ESQUIRE P.O. Box 3574

Westchester, Pennsylvania 19381

For the Defendant Asya Richardson:

RONALD A. SMITH, ESQUIRE Ronald A. Smith and Associates 1617 JFK Boulevard, Suite 1240 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

For the Defendant Thais Thompson:

PAUL J. HETZNECKER, ESQUIRE 1420 Walnut Street, Ste 911 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19102

For the Defendant James Morris:

RONALD THOMPSON, ESQUIRE 3002 Lincoln Drive

Suite J

Marlton, New Jersey 08053





(Appearances Continued)

WAYNE POWELL, ESQUIRE

811 Church Road

101 Parragon Building

Cherry Hill, New Jersey 08002

Audio Operator:

Mike Delrossi

Transcribed by:

DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING

P.O. Box 129

Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026-129

PHONE: (856) 435-7172 FAX: (856) 435-7124

Email: <u>Dianadoman@Comcast.net</u>

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

T	N	D	E	X

OPENING STATEMENTS

${\tt Mr.}$	Bresnick	3
Mr.	Warren	32
Mr.	McMahon	60
Mr.	Thompson	77
Mr.	Harmlin	94
Mr.	Smith	102
Mr.	Hetznecker	106

Page 4

(Beginning of Requested Portion at 1:39:06)

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, as I indicated to you before we broke for lunch, the next order of business are the opening statements of counsel. And, Mr. Bresnick, are you ready for the Government?

MR. BRESNICK: I am, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BRESNICK: May I proceed?

THE COURT: You may open.

MR. BRESNICK: Thank you. It was 3:00 in the morning on August 10, 2005. With a court authorized wiretap in hand, federal agents were listening in on two cell phones belonging to this man, this defendant, Alton Coles, who also went by the name of Ace Capone.

You see, by that time, by that early morning hour, agents had already identified Coles as being the leader of a large-scale multi-state drug trafficking organization. And in that early morning hour, agents heard Cole have a series of conversations with his girlfriend, with his drug trafficking co-conspirator, with his co-defendant in this case, Monique Pullins, sitting right here.

And what the agents heard was Coles repeatedly and urgently telling Pullins to get rid of the gun that he left in her apartment, and get rid of it in a hurry. Put it in a bag and throw it down the trash chute.

Page 5

They heard him say, put it in a bag and throw it down the trash chute, over and over again. Now with the benefit of the court authorized wiretap, you're going to hear these conversations.

You're going to hear Alton Coles talking to Monique
Pullins. You're going to hear Coles telling Pullins to get rid
of his gun.

Now, in fact, what you're going to hear is Coles, in an effort to be secret, to hide what it was that he was talking about, didn't even call it a gun. He referred to it as, the black thing. Take the black thing that I left there. Put the black thing in a bag. Throw the black thing down the trash chute.

You'll hear Pullins ask him, you don't think it's going to go off? And you'll hear Coles respond, it's not going to go off, just make sure it's in the bag.

Now the agents also heard Coles telling Pullins to make sure that she went to the trash chute in the morning to recover the black thing. Well ladies and gentlemen, that opportunity never came. Because just three hours later, at 6:00 in the morning, approximately 250 local and federal law enforcement officers spanned out across Philadelphia into the outer counties and crossing lines into New Jersey, to execute court authorized searches of 23 different properties.

Twenty-three different properties and 11 different

Page 6

automobiles owned and controlled by these six defendants. By these six defendants and their co-conspirators and associates. And at one location after another, agents found quantities of cocaine and crack cocaine, they found guns and tools and devices used to cook, package and sell cocaine and crack cocaine.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, let's start with what the agents found at the home of Monique Pullins. At 1416 Clearview Street in North Philadelphia. Well there they found a money counting machine. They found a digital scale used to weigh and measure cocaine for packaging and sale. They found tally sheets, which you'll hear are simply small sheets of paper used to describe payments owed to and received by Alton Coles for drug sales.

In fact, you're going to hear even more conversations between Alton Coles and Monique Pullins about tally sheets.

And from the basement of the building, from the basement of Monique Pullins' building, from the trash dumpster, the dumpster that's connected to the trash chute, agents found a Glock 9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun loaded with 16 live rounds of ammunition.

And yes, ladies and gentlemen, it was wrapped tightly in a towel and it was black. Now that's just one location the agents searched that day. Let me tell you about a few other properties that they searched on August 10, 2005.

Page 7

Well, at another location, 339 East Essex Avenue, the location that the testimony, surveillance by law enforcement and the wiretap will prove was controlled by Alton Coles, as well as this man right here, Tim Baukman, Coles' top lieutenant, his partner in crime. Timothy Baukman, also known as Tim Gotti.

Ace Capone, Tim Gotti. At the apartment that they controlled, 339 East Essex Avenue, agents found a treasure trove of evidence. In fact, what they found at that location was an arsenal. Because there, they found not one, not two or three, ten, a total of ten firearms. Which included 2 rifles, one shotgun and 7 semi-automatic handguns. One that had an extended clip that was loaded with 32 live rounds of ammunition. Another that had the serial number obliterated, scratched right out of the middle, so it couldn't be traced back to anybody.

The agents also found, in addition to those 10 firearms and the ammunition found in them, another 384 loose rounds of assorted ammunition. But that's not all. Because in addition to that, those guns, in addition to that ammunition, agents also found a hydraulic press machine. You'll see this hydraulic press machine. It's about this big, maybe this wide and it had 12 tons worth of pressure. Hydraulic machine, press machine with 12 tons worth of pressure, that Coles and Baukman and their fellow gang members would use to form cocaine power

into kilogram quantities of cocaine.

Now a kilogram quantity of cocaine you'll hear is frequently referred to as a brick of cocaine. And that's because, when the cocaine powder is put into the hydraulic

press machine, and as it's compressed into the general shape

and size of a brick.

So you'll frequently hear the kilogram quantity of cocaine as referred to as a brick. And they found that hydraulic press machine in that apartment.

Well what else did they find? They found another approximately half a kilogram of cocaine, 7 grams of crack cocaine. They found even more tally sheets at that property.

Again, tally sheets are pieces of paper used to describe money owed to and received by Alton Coles, Tim Baukman, and others, from the sale of drugs.

They also found drug trafficking paraphernalia. Drug trafficking paraphernalia, such as dust masks. And you'll see these dust masks. Dust masks that Coles and Baukman and others would wear to prevent them from inhaling the drug when handling. They also had rubber gloves in the apartment that Coles and Baukman would wear to prevent them from having the cocaine oil seep into their skin and get into their bloodstream, again, when handling the cocaine.

And from the trash in that apartment. In the trash at 339 East Essex Avenue, agents found 44 used kilo wrappers.

Now a kilo wrapper is simply the wrapping and the packaging from a kilogram quantity of cocaine. You'll see the wrappers. You'll see the cellophane and the duct tape used to wrap the kilos of cocaine. And you'll see that these wrappers have cocaine residue on them. Clearly indicating that they had been used to wrap kilogram quantities of cocaine.

Page 9

Now one kilogram of cocaine, you'll hear, has an approximate wholesale value of about \$20,000. Forty-four kilograms of cocaine, ladies and gentlemen, is worth more than \$800,000.

Now an interesting thing about this property, you'll hear that the rent for it was paid for on a monthly basis by Tim Baukman, sitting right here. Only Baukman didn't pay for it in his own name.

He didn't pay for it from his own bank account.

Instead, he paid for it from a bank account that he opened up in the name of his nine year old son, Tauheed Baukman. And you'll see these checks. You'll see what I'm talking about during the trial.

And Baukman had did this in an effort to conceal his identity, so nobody would be able to tie him to the property.

Well Tauheed Baukman is renting the apartment, not Tim Baukman, that's what he was thinking. That's what was going through his mind. It was an effort to conceal his ownership and interest in the property.

Page 10

The property that had the ten firearms, the 44 kilo wrappers, the drug trafficking paraphernalia and the ammunition.

Now this is going to be a common theme during the trial, ladies and gentlemen. Both Alton Coles and Tim Baukman would frequently and repeatedly put assets in their minor children's names.

In Baukman's case, it was his 9-year-old son Tauheed.

In Coles' case, it was his six-year-old son Naseem.

For example, you'll hear -- just one example of many, you'll hear that in 2004 Alton Coles wanted to buy a car, a Ford Excursion. He didn't put it in his own name. Instead, he had the car titled in the name of his 6-year-old son, Naseem Coles.

Now his 6-year-old son, Naseem Coles, needless to say, was not driving. This car was Alton Coles'. In addition to putting assets and property in their children's names, they also had their girlfriends do it for him -- or for them. Both Coles and Baukman would have their girlfriends put property and assets in loans, in cars, in their name. Again, to keep Coles' name off those assets. To keep Baukman's name off those assets.

And we'll talk more about that during the course of the trial. What else did the agents search and what else did they find on August 10, 2005?

Well at the home of James Morris, the man sitting

Page 11

there in the beige jacket in the corner. James Morris, along with Thais Thompson, sitting right here at the end, at 5 North Burden Hill Road, New Jersey, in Quinton, New Jersey. Agents found in the bedroom upstairs, in Thais Thompson's purse in the bedroom upstairs, a loaded firearm. They found a Smith & Wesson 9 millimeter semi-automatic handgun. Ladies and gentlemen, that gun was loaded with six live rounds of ammunition in the magazine, and one in the chamber.

What's one in the chamber mean? That means, that gun was ready to fire. That bullet was there, ready to fire. And all she had to do was pull the trigger.

Now you're going to hear that Thompson had a permit for that gun. It's true, she had a permit for the gun. But you're also going to hear, just because someone has a permit for a gun, it doesn't mean they can use the gun for any purpose they want.

It doesn't mean they can use the gun for an illegal purpose. For example, protecting a stash of drugs, or protecting all the money made in selling drugs, or protecting the money you're going to be using in buying drugs.

Now keeping that in mind, you're going to hear that, in addition to the gun in Thomson's purse, the loaded gun in Thompson's purse upstairs, agents also found in the house approximately \$560,000. Five hundred and sixty thousand dollars, strewn about the house in bundles here and there and

Page 12

everywhere. All over the house. Including, hidden up in the attic in between the rafters, on top of the insulation.

They also found more kilo wrappers. They found a money counting machine. They found a digital scale. Again, used to measure cocaine for packaging and sale.

And from the car out front, the car in the driveway of the residence, the car -- the Chevy Suburban, that the evidence and the testimony will prove was used by James Morris, agents found another half a kilogram of cocaine hidden inside the wheel well of the car.

And they found another \$2,500 in drug proceeds in the car. What else? At the home of Tim Baukman, 2967 School House Lane, agents found \$25,000 in cash. Agents found thousands of dollars worth of other valuables and luxury items.

In addition to that cash and luxury items, agents also found the following firearms and ammunition. A fully automatic machine gun loaded with 29 live rounds of ammunition.

Fully automatic machine gun. Let me explain what fully automatic means to you, ladies and gentlemen. That means you press the trigger once, and it sprays a firestorm of bullets.

That fully automatic machine gun was in Tim Baukman's home, along with a semi-automatic handgun loaded with 30 live rounds of ammunition. As well as a 38 caliber revolver loaded with 5 live rounds of ammunition.

Page 13

Now at the home of Alton Coles, the home at 117
Dillons Lane in Mullica Hill, New Jersey, the home he just
moved into approximately a week before these searches on August
10, 2005. A home worth approximately a half a million dollars.
The home that he was living in with this defendant, Asya
Richardson, sitting right here, with the blue lapel.

In this house, agents found a pistol magazine, a gun barrel cleaning device, more tally sheets. Again, used to describe payments owed and received for drug sales. And they found a gun box that corresponds with a gun that Coles was arrested with approximately a year earlier.

And they found a hundred and fifty four loose rounds of assorted ammunition. Plus, agents found substantially more drugs, more guns and more cash at the homes and in the cars of these gang members, associates and co-conspirators. Including \$114,000 in another property that Coles controlled, and that was lived in by another one of his girlfriends, Kristina Latney. And you'll hear about that during the trial.

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Michael Bresnick, as you heard earlier. I'm an Assistant U.S. Attorney. With me at counsel table is Richard Lloret, also from the U.S. Attorney's Office. Special Agent John Bowman from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives. Back here we have Special Agent Anthony Tropea from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms & Explosives. Charlie Humphrey from ATF as well.

Page 14

Charlene Horay, Special Agent Horay from ATF. As well as Special Agent Raymond Armstrong from the Internal Revenue Service.

Together, we represent the Government in this criminal trial against these six defendants. Together, we'll prove to you that Alton Coles and Tim Baukman ran a large-scale multi-state drug trafficking operation that started in Southwest Philadelphia in 1998, or earlier, and quickly spread through the years. Throughout Philadelphia into the outer counties and across state lines into New Jersey.

To Maryland, to Texas, and even Mexico. You'll hear about that, ladies and gentlemen. And we'll prove to you that Coles and Baukman, along with Thompson, Pullins and Morris, and many others, used guns, and lots of them, to protect their drugs, their turf, and all of the money they made selling their drugs.

Now I'd like to pull up now, if I could, Special Agent Horay, an organizational chart. It is awfully small print, and I'm not sure exactly how well any of you can see this. But this is a general organizational chart of what we expect the testimony and the evidence will prove during the course of this trial in this case.

Now you see, there are a lot of names there are a lot of faces on this chart. And the reason for that is very simple. There were a lot of people involved in this

Page 15

conspiracy. There's a long conspiracy, lasting from 1998 to 2005. Got a lot of people involved. Everybody had a distinct role in this conspiracy.

What I'd like to do now, and you're going to hear about all these people. But what I'd like to do now, is just focus on the people at the top. The people, the defendants who are on trial in this courtroom here today.

Thais Thompson, James Morris, Alton Coles, Timothy
Baukman, Monique Pullins and Asya Richardson. Those are the
six on trial here today. And just to be clear, let me do this
-- defendant Thais Thompson, right here; Asya Richardson, who
was living with Alton Coles; Monique Pullins; James Morris, in
the corner, Morris was living with Thais Thompson; Tim Baukman,
the man who had the machine gun, and Alton Coles.

Now at the head of this organization, at the very top you've got Alton Coles. He's the one in charge of this organization, he's the one in charge of the business.

I use the word business, ladies and gentlemen, because it was a business. It was an illegal business, it was a criminal business, sure, but it was still a business. They had storage centers, where they would maintain storage facilities for their product, which was drugs, cocaine and crack cocaine.

Storage centers where they'd store their drugs for subsequent sales. They had a distribution network, people who

Page 16

were responsible for getting their product out on the streets, selling their drugs on the streets. They even had accounting ledgers and books of the business.

That's what the tally sheets were. An accounting -it might be not very sophisticated, but that's what the tally
sheets were, is an accounting of the sales of the drugs of the
business. And this business, ladies and gentlemen, had a CEO,
it had a chief executive. And that chief executive was Alton
Coles. He was the man at the top.

It was his organization, it was his business. He was the one ultimately responsible. He was the one making decisions and ordering and instructing people around.

And you're going to hear plenty about that. Now as with any business, it needed a source of supply. In this case, one source of supply for Alton Coles came from James Morris, again, sitting right there in the corner. James Morris was living in the house with Thais Thompson at 5 North Burden Hill Road, Quinton, New Jersey. The house where they found the kilo wrappers, the gun, the loaded gun in Thompson's purse, the \$560,000 in cash all over the house.

James Morris was one source of the cocaine, one source of drugs for Alton Coles. And you'll hear Morris got his drugs from Mexico, and you're going to hear plenty about that.

Now one individual who was responsible for

Page 17

maintaining a storage facility was Monique Pullins. Pullins, you'll remember, is the individual that Coles was telling to get rid of his gun, get rid of my -- I'm sorry, get rid of the black thing. Get rid of the black thing. That's Monique Pullins.

You'll hear that she maintained large amounts of drugs in her apartment, in her house on Clearview Street, and she distributed it at Coles' direction, at Coles' insistence.

Now as I said, both Coles and Baukman would use their minor children. They'd put property and assets in their minor kids' names. Well they're not on this chart, ladies and gentlemen, but their girlfriends are. Their girlfriends, who would do the same for Coles and Baukman, who would put cars in their name for Coles and Baukman. Who would put property in their names for Coles and Baukman. Who would obtain loans in their name for Coles and Baukman. All the while, keeping Coles and Baukman away from the paperwork, away from anybody who might be looking into what their assets truly were.

And in this case, it is Asya Richardson, the defendant Asya Richardson, the individual, the defendant who was living with Alton Coles. In Tim Baukman's case, it was his girlfriend, Tiffany Dixon. She's not on trial here today. But Asya Richardson is.

Now the indictment charges, and you heard the Judge give you a description of what the charges are in this case,

Page 18

and we're going to talk to you more about that at the end of the case. I saw a number of you just taking notes furiously, trying to keep things -- keep things straight.

We're going to be addressing this again to you when we come back to you at the end of the case. But generally, the indictment charges that this conspiracy, these group of conspirators, the Coles Cocaine Gang, agreed to sell 50 grams of crack cocaine, or 5 kilograms of cocaine powder, from 1998 to 2005.

Again, 50 grams of crack cocaine, or 5 kilograms of cocaine powder during that 7 year period. And, ladies and gentlemen, that's an enormous amount of drugs. It's an enormous amount of drugs.

But to this conspiracy, to this conspiracy it's just a drop in the bucket. It was a drop in the bucket. Because you'll hear that this conspiracy could move 50 grams of crack cocaine in a single deal, in a single day.

They could sell 5 kilograms of cocaine powder in about a week. Let alone 7 years. In fact, what the evidence will be, what the testimony will be, is that Coles and Baukman, with the help of their fellow gang members, sold, not 5 kilograms of cocaine powder, not 5 kilograms of cocaine powder, but more than a thousand kilograms of cocaine powder. That's more than 2,000 pounds of cocaine powder.

That's more than one ton of cocaine that Coles and

Page 19

Baukman and others put on the streets.

And you're going to hear that they sold not just 50 grams of crack cocaine, again, not 50 grams, but more than 600 kilograms of crack cocaine. Sold on the street by Alton Coles, Tim Baukman and others.

And you'll hear that the wholesale value of the drugs that they sold conservatively estimated at 25 million dollars. Now how are we going to prove this to you, ladies and gentlemen? How are we going to prove this more than a thousand grams -- a thousand kilograms of cocaine, more than 600 kilograms of crack cocaine?

Well, you're going to hear from the law enforcement officers, you're going to hear from the ATF agents who were investigating this case during 2004 leading up to the federal searches, as I've described, on August 10, 2005.

And you're going to see what was recovered on August 10, 2005. Not just from the homes of these defendants, but of many others, their co-conspirators' home.

Now you're not going to see a thousand kilograms of cocaine on this witness stand, ladies and gentlemen. The agents did recover a thousand kilograms of cocaine on August 10, 2005. But what that date was, August 10, 2005 was, it was just a snapshot in time, it was just one moment, a single morning in the life of a 7 year long conspiracy.

And the best way I can describe it is this, you're

Page 20

all familiar with McDonald's restaurants, I'm sure. You've got the golden arches, and you've got the sign out front, I think it says over a billion sold, or billions and billions sold, something like that.

It doesn't mean if you were to walk into any individual McDonald's store at any given day you're going to see a billion hamburger buns, or you're going to see a billion hamburger patties. No, you're going to see what that business is doing on that particular day. It's a snapshot in time, really, of what kind of business that store is doing on that day.

Now if you want a better idea of how the business is doing, what kind of sales they're involved in over a 7 year long period, well, what would you do?

Maybe talk to the cook, the person who's working in back? Maybe you talk to the person up front who's working the cash register, find out, you know, how many orders of how many burgers you get a day? You can talk to the manager. You might even look at the accounting ledgers, the books and records of the business.

Well that's what we're going to do for you in this case. Because, in addition to hearing from law enforcement, in addition to seeing what was recovered on a single summer morning in 2005, you're going to hear from people who were part of this organization.

7.

Page 21

You're going to hear from the people who were part of this business. You're going to hear from people who knew Alton Coles, who lived with him, who worked side-by-side with him to put his drugs out on the street.

Now you might not like these people, they were drug dealers, after all. They were dealing drugs for Coles. So you might not like them. But you will be able to believe them.

And you'll be able to believe them, because everything they're going to testify about is going to be corroborated by additional evidence.

You're going to see the accounting records of this business. You'll see the tally sheets. You're going to see the used kilogram wrappers found at the homes, 44 such kilo wrappers, used kilo wrappers with cocaine residue on them, clearly proving they'd been used at the property at 339 East Essex Avenue.

And you're going to see the money, the massive amounts of money that this business was dealing in. \$560,000 at the home of James Morris. Another \$114,000 in a safe in another property that Coles controlled. Twenty-five thousand more at the home of Tim Baukman, along with a machine gun.

But that's not all, ladies and gentlemen, that's not the best way the Government is going to corroborate those witnesses for you. Because the most compelling evidence in this case comes, not from any of those sources, the most

Page 22

compelling evidence in this case comes from Alton Coles, himself.

Because with the benefit of the Court authorized wiretap, you're going to hear Coles' conversations from the summer of 2005. You're going to hear Coles talking to his -- his co-conspirators. You're going to hear him ordering the delivery of drugs, where, when, to whom and how much. You're going to hear Coles talking about how much money's owed from selling drugs.

And you're going to hear Coles talking about instructing people to go out and get the money that he's owed from selling drugs. You're going to hear all of this and more.

For example, May 19, 2005, is the very first day, the very first day that agents were entitled to go up on that wire. The judge had authorized the order -- had given the order authorizing the wiretap and the agents flipped the switch and they went up on that wire on May 19, 2005.

On that first day, agents heard a series of conversations between Alton Coles and one of his top distributors of cocaine, Jamar Campbell. Campbell had just been arrested three days earlier, May 16, 2005. He'd just been arrested by the Delaware County Detectives. And at the time of his arrest, he had in his car a 40 caliber Glock semi-automatic pistol. And he had 124 grams of cocaine in his car. That's Jamar Campbell.

Page 23

Three days after that arrest, Coles is talking to Campbell on the phone and the agents are listening. And during these conversations, Coles is asking Campbell frequently, he keeps asking Campbell about the work in the car. The work and the boots. I gotta get the work, gotta get the boots out of the car.

Well the term, the work, is a common street term agents know, for drugs. Drugs, after all, is a business, it's their work. And Coles isn't using the term drugs on the phone. He's calling it, the work.

But at the time the agents didn't know what Coles was talking about with the boots. But Coles is definitely telling Campbell he's got to get the work and got to get the boots out of that car. That was May 19th, 2005.

Just two days later, by May 21, 2005, agents learned that Jamar Campbell had been a volunteer fireman for the Green Ridge Fire Company, Delaware County. And at the time Campbell was arrested by Delaware County Detectives, he had in his car, not just the Glock semi-automatic pistol, not just 124 grams of cocaine, but he also had a pair of fireman's boots in the car.

Fireman's boots and a fireman's bunker uniform, the bunker pants. And you'll see these boots and this bunker uniform.

Well agents quickly retrieved those -- the fireman's uniform, the boots and the pants, searched them, and found

Page 24

hidden inside the lining of the fireman's bunker pants, another 187 grams of cocaine. Hidden inside the fireman's uniform.

Hundred and eighty-seven grams of cocaine. That's more than 6 ounces of cocaine. That's bigger than the size of softball of cocaine.

Ladies and gentlemen, that's just in the first few days of the wire. The first few days of the wire. You're going to hear plenty more about that from Coles himself on that wire. Over, and over, and over again.

Now in addition to the drug dealing you're going to hear about in this case, and you're going to hear plenty of it, you're also going to hear about a variety of other crimes committed by these gang members. Always in an effort to coverup, hide what they're doing. Conceal their activities. For example, you're going to hear that the defendant, Asya Richardson, again, with the blue lapel, lied on a bank loan application.

She lied for Alton Coles. You're going to hear that Alton Coles in 2005 wanted to buy a new home. A home worth about -- about a half a million dollars. I think it was about \$460,000. But as with so many other things, Coles didn't want to put his name on the paperwork. So what did he do? He had it titled in her name.

Asya Richardson. Asya Richardson is titled on the property. Even though Coles himself paid \$100,000 down on the

Page 25

property, leaving another \$360,000 outstanding. So Asya Richardson had to obtain a loan.

So she filled out a bank loan application, and, as with many bank loan applications that I'm sure you know, you may have seen in your life, they have employment information. You have to put down where you work, what your income is to make sure you qualify for the loan. Well on this form, Asya Richardson stated that she was earning \$9,500 per month.

That was a lie. She was not earning \$9,500 a month, what she was earning was nothing. She was earning zero dollars a month.

She was dependent, fully dependent financially on Alton Coles and his drug money. And the reason why she lied on this bank loan application was, because if she had put the truth that she made nothing, well, of course, she wouldn't have qualified for the loan.

If she doesn't qualify for the loan, she doesn't get the property. If she doesn't get the property, Coles doesn't get the property. Well she did lie on the loan and you're going to see and hear about that during the trial.

Now in addition to Asya Richardson's lies, you're also going to hear about even more lies by Thais Thompson, the defendant sitting right here at the end. You're going to hear about how Thompson testified before the Federal Grand Jury that was investigating this case back in November, 2006.

Page 26

She was told she was under oath. She was told that if she lied about anything, she could be prosecuted for perjury, a separate federal offense. She was told that she did not have to answer any question if the truthful answer to that question would tend to incriminate her.

Nevertheless, she chose to lie. You'll hear she was asked if she ever paid \$25,000 in cash to anybody, ever, in her life. She said no, never did. Never have. You'll hear that's a lie. In fact, the evidence will show and you'll see that just a few months earlier she had paid \$25,000 in cash to pay for the lawyer for this man, Alton Coles, Ace Capone.

You'll hear about that perjurious testimony in the Grand Jury. In addition, you'll hear that Thais Thompson was asked if she was aware of any bank accounts of her boyfriend, James Morris. Right there, in the corner. James Morris, the man she was living with at 5 North Burden Hill Road in New Jersey. James Morris, who had half a kilogram of cocaine in his car. Had \$560,000 in cash in his home. That James Morris.

Well Thais Thompson said, she really wasn't aware of any bank accounts of James Morris. No, sorry, don't really know about any of that.

That, too, was a lie. In fact you'll hear just a few months before she testified in that Grand Jury, she deposited a check into the bank account of James Morris, and she did so at Morris' direction.

Page 27

And you'll hear about that lie, as well. You'll also hear that she was asked about the source of the \$560,000 that was recovered from her home, and she lied about that, as well.

Ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear what Thais
Thompson had to say, under oath, to another federal jury. Now
in addition to Asya Richardson's lies to the bank, in addition
to Thais Thompson's lies to the Federal Grand Jury, you're
going to hear about even more acts of deception.

Because this was no ordinary drug gang. In addition to being violent, and they were violent, ladies and gentlemen, you're going to hear about shootouts with rival drug gang members. Including a shootout at the Philadelphia Zoo in April of 2002 that resulted in a homicide.

You're going to hear that this gang was also extremely sophisticated. Very sophisticated, because Coles and Baukman, in fact, co-owned a company. It was a music company, a record company that they called Take Down Records. And they used this business, Take Down Records, to make themselves appear to be legitimate businessmen. As a way to explain to the public their life of extravagance and all the money that they made, all the wealth that they accumulated over the years by selling drugs.

You see, Coles and Baukman hid their true nature, their true selves, their true livelihood as violent drug dealers, in almost every way imaginable.

Page 28

They hid behind their children, as I've discussed. They've hid behind their girlfriends, as I talked about. They even hid behind the language that they used. Coles referring to the black thing, instead of the gun. Coles referring to the work and the boots in the car. Instead of being clear about what he's talking about.

And, ladies and gentlemen, Coles and Baukman hid behind this business Take Down Records. Take Down Records, you'll see, was really nothing more than like Hollywood set. You know those Hollywood sets, maybe you walk into a kind of a fake town, you got a bunch of storefronts. Maybe you got a barbershop here, you got a, you know, saloon there, or general store. And from the front, well, you know, it looks real enough, you've got that storefront.

But if you kind of take a look around it, you see.

there's nothing there, it's just a store front. There's

nothing behind it. That's Take Down Records.

It was -- was just a store front. There was a Take

Down Records, ladies and gentlemen, it was incorporated in

2002. They had rappers. They even -- well, they had rappers

for sure. They even had a studio, meager as it was.

But when you get past it, when you get past that facade, when you get past that store front and you take a look behind it, there's nothing there. Nothing except the drugs and the guns and the violence. All associated with Alton Coles and

Page 29

1 Tim Baukman.

Well for one thing, even their rappers were among those who dealt drugs for Coles and Baukman. For another thing, you're going to hear about supposed legitimate sources of income for Take Down Records. Parties that they threw, CD's they put out. Concerts that they co-promoted.

But none of these business ventures made them any money. They either lost money from them, or if they made a profit, it wasn't very much. And certainly not enough to explain the prodigious expenditures of Alton Coles and Tim Baukman from 2002 to 2005 when Take Down was incorporated.

Coles' Mercedes and Bentley, Baukman's Jaguar.

Coles' half a million dollar house. Baukman's \$25,000 in cash.

The one real public display, the one real big public business venture that they had you'll hear about, it was called the Spring Hip Hop Explosion.

And it was held in the Spectrum in South Philadelphia in April of 2002. Not long after the homicide at the Philadelphia Zoo, by the way.

You'll hear that there were performers that you might have heard of at this concert. Beanie Sigel, Jay Zee, as well as certain rappers under the Take Down name. But you'll hear that, even from this big venture, they didn't make any money. Not only did they not make any money, they lost at least \$10,000.

Page 30

So you'll see in this way that Take Down Records was just their -- was just their store front. Just their facade. But when you look around that corner, when you get past that facade and you look behind it, then you see there's nothing there.

It wasn't pretty. And it wasn't legal. And Coles and Baukman didn't want you to see it, but we're going to show it to you.

In fact, everything you need to know about Alton
Coles and Tim Baukman, co-owners of Take Down Records, you're
going to hear about in a conversation that the two of them had.

It's a conversation between them after one of their top distributors of cocaine, a man named Dante Tucker, failed a drug test.

You see, Dante Tucker had recently been released from prison. He went to see his probation officer, took a drug test and failed. He had cocaine in his system. And Coles and Baukman are heard on Coles' phone talking about how Tucker could have failed this drug test.

Well, Coles surmises, I guess he wasn't using the mask and the gloves. I guess he wasn't using the mask and the gloves. He's breathing it. That's what Coles said. He's breathing it.

Do you know what Coles also said? I always use the mask and the gloves. I always use the mask and the gloves,

ladies and gentlemen. Those were Alton Coles's words. He's breathing it. Those are Coles's words. And you're going to hear them.

Page 31

They're not talking about asbestos here, ladies and gentlemen. They're talking about somebody who just failed a drug test. So this is Take Down Records. This is Coles talking to Baukman, this is Take Down Records, ladies and gentlemen. You got drug dealers for rappers, drug dealers for ownership, and the sound of gunfire for its primary soundtrack.

So at the end of this case, after you've heard all the testimony, after you've seen all the evidence, after you've heard all the phone calls of Alton Coles, after you've seen the financial documents and other records proving that Take Down Records was simply a shell business, used to shield Coles and Baukman from the harsh light of reality, we're going to come back to you, my colleague Rich Lloret and I will come back to you, and ask that you find the defendants guilty.

Guilty of the drug trafficking. Guilty of the lying to the bank. Guilty of the violence and the gun crimes. Guilty of the perjury before the Grand Jury. And guilty of all of the Federal crimes with which they're charged. We'll ask that you return the only verdict that's reasonable in this case, the only verdict that makes sense in this case. And that's that you find all defendants guilty of all counts in which they're charged.

Page 32

Thank you all very much.

THE COURT: Mr. Warren?

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Judge. Wow. That was something else, wasn't it? What did we hear about here? Wiretaps, homicides, violent shootouts, machine guns, turf wars, scales, large sums of cash, gang members, tally sheets for drug debts.

And the list goes on and on. Before I get really started with this, I'd like you all to ask yourselves honestly this one question. After hearing all that stuff and after hearing all the charges that the Judge went over this morning which comes from this catalog right here. All the stuff he just said, the charges the Judge discussed, all the stuff that they say my client did, how many of you all think he's innocent?

Ask yourself honestly that question. As you sit here, right now, after hearing all that stuff, do you think he's innocent? Well, folks, the answer to that question should be, yeah, we sure do.

Do you know why? The Judge explained it to you.

It's called the presumption of innocense. Fancy ten dollar legal word. What did the Judge say? You got to presume the defendant's innocent. Now what's that mean in English?

Presume means assume. It means, in your head, you are thinking, what? That's an innocent man.

Page 33

That's what the presumption of innocense means. The only thing you've heard right now is a speech. Okay? A speech.

The only other thing you've heard are the charges, which are contained in the indictment. Now what's that? An accusation. It's what they say. And all he did is get up here and tell you how he thinks he's going to be able to prove what they say.

The only thing you've got so far are words. And it was a very theatrical production. Full of buzz words, violence, drug dealing. Scary stuff, huh? Serious allegations, right?

That's all you've got. And in order for you to do what you're supposed to do, you've got to give my client the benefit of what you said you'd give him. He starts with a clean slate. Now the only way that he can start with a clean slate is, if each and everyone of you actually believes in your heads, that man's innocent.

That's how we start this trial. That's how you have to approach it. If you're not doing that, you're not giving him, not only what he's entitled, but what all of us are entitled to. So start out thinking right now, he's innocent, he's innocent, all three of them are innocent.

Okay? That's how you should approach it from this point forward. They have the burden, not of giving a good

Page 34

speech, not of trying to use a bunch of character evidence,
violence, a bunch of buzz words. They have the burden to come
forward with evidence, and you haven't heard the evidence yet.

And I'm going to talk a little bit about the evidence, but you haven't heard anything yet. And you should approach a lot of their evidence with a healthy degree of skepticism, for reasons I will explain to you in a moment.

But let's start out here with what I suggest to you is going to be the basic dispute between Alton and I on the one hand, and the entire full force and majesty of the United States Government, complete with TV monitors and they've got agents and computers and search warrants and wiretaps.

And it's Alton and I, against them. Difficult odds, to say the least. What do they say? They say, and the Judge went over them, but they say in this book, I called it a catalog, these are the actual criminal charges against Alton and some of the other folks back there. But the basic one and the one that really drives all the other charges, is this one. It starts with conspiracy, it's agreeing with other folks to deal drugs.

What's called a continuing criminal enterprise, which is fancy name for what is sometimes referred to as the Drug Kingpin Statute. And take a wild guess who they put at the top of that list? Why, that would be Alton. Not the most flattering picture, by the way, but that is him. We will give

Page 35

1 them that one, all right.

Drug kingpin, what's that involve? Drugs.

Possessing guns, to do what? Further a drug trafficking

conspiracy. Drugs. Laundering what? Drug profits. Using a

telephone to what? Facilitate a drug conspiracy. Investing

the proceeds in an enterprise that effects interstate commerce.

Proceeds of what? Drugs.

Maintaining a storage facility, for what? Drugs.

All right? The common theme on all these charges that have been brought against my client are that he is a drug kingpin.

A drug dealer. A violent, gun toting, gang member and tally sheet drafting drug dealer. And it is summarized in this one allegation right here. It's called the manner and means section of an indictment. What the Government does, they -- this is the fifth version of it, by the way, that means this is version number five. It's called a superceding indictment. There's nothing super about a superceding indictment. That just means they added charges as time went by and brought additional folks into the case.

But here's what they really say, and it's stripped down to one paragraph. It's on page 4, paragraph 2. "Alton Coles was the leader and organizer of a cocaine and cocaine base, crack, distribution gang, hereinafter referred to as The Coles Cocaine Gang, which distributed in excess of five kilograms, that is, approximately 1,200 kilograms of cocaine,

Page 36

and an excess of 50 grams, that is, approximately 600 kilograms of cocaine base, also called crack, conservatively valued at no less than \$25,200,000, between in or about January 1998 and on or about August 10th, 2005."

That, stripped in a nutshell, is what they say he did. Now upon reading this, he was actually shocked to learn that he is a multi-millionaire. Because until he read this, he didn't really know that he had made 25.2 million dollars during a 1998 to 2005 time span.

It wasn't true. Okay? He doesn't have 25 million dollars. They keep talking about all this stuff he bought. These cars, most of them were financed, folks. This house in Mullica Hill, New Jersey. Well, they put down \$100,000, but they financed the balance of the purchase price.

Most of the things he acquired, that we'll go into in this case, what you're going to see is they took out loans for. And, sure enough, some of the stuff was titled in other people's names. Do you know why? Because this multi-millionaire here couldn't get credit. Okay?

All right. And we'll go into it and we'll go through the paperwork, but at the end of the day what you're going to see is, this multi-millionaire, this guy who reaped 25 million dollars worth of drug sales during an eight year time period, had to use a girlfriend, or a significant other, to get loans to buy stuff like cars and a house.

Page 37

Okay? You may hear about some other properties he got. Do you want to know where he got those from? Sheriff's sales. Auctions. Sheriff's sales.

Yet according to the Government, he's a multi-millionaire. As I said, it came as news to him. This part, the 25 million dollar part, he actually wishes was true. It's not. Like a lot of stuff you're going to hear in this case.

That's the Government's view of things. That's what they say. Big, multi-million dollar, crack dealing, gun toting, gang operating, violent guy, somebody who should just scare the bejesus out of each and everyone of you.

And make no mistake, that's part of what he's doing there. Guns, drugs, homicides, violence, murders. Scary stuff. Very scary stuff. That's what they say. And we'll talk about how they're going to prove that in just a second. But you're going to see in this case, I suggest to you, and some of it's going to come from their evidence.

And if they don't present it, we'll present it during our case. The way it works in a criminal trial is that the Government has the burden of proof. They got to prove all this stuff. Okay? Therefore, they get to go first. Once they're done, we get the opportunity to present evidence, if we want to.

We don't have to, but we can, if we want to. And if

Page 38

they don't present the stuff that we believe balances out the picture here, we'll put it up there for you. They say he's a gun toting drug kingpin, homicides, bodies, etcetera, etcetera.

What's the sic phrase, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. That's not mine, I think Shakespear wrote it. But that's basically what you just heard.

Here's that Alton Coles was. About 1997, 1998, he was a barber. He cut hair. That's what he did for a living. Ace Capone, boy, that sounds sinister doesn't it? Ace Capone, ooh, him, Gotti, whoa, man, that's bad news. They must be guilty of something.

They used nicknames. Ace Capone, he got the nickname Ace, because he gambled. He had a barbershop, there was another fellow that worked there, and what you do at the barbershop is you can sell, lease, rent, whatever you want to call it, other barber chairs, so that barbers can come in a cut hair there.

The other guy's name was Deuce. Ace, Deuce, that's where that comes from. And that's because he gambled. He liked to gamble. But that's where the Ace name comes from. Nothing sinister about it, it was a nickname. All right. But it sounds bad. That's why you're going to hear it.

Take a wild guess. The Government will not be referring to him as Alton, or Al. No, it's going to be Ace Capone.

Page 39

Why? Because it makes him look bad. It makes him sound guilty, like a criminal. And they will spin the evidence as best they possibly can to try and validate what they say happened here. That's their job, they're advocates.

But I'm going to be on the other side, putting you back in focus here. Ace Capone does not prove anything, other than it was a name -- a nickname that he used.

He's a barber. He rents out other barber chairs.

He's making money doing that. And then he gets involved in the entertainment industry. A particular branch of the entertainment industry. The so called rap or hip hop music industry. And what does that entail? He forms a company called Take Down Records.

Now you listen to Mr. Bresnick here and you literally think that Take Down Records was constructed of, you know, some of these legal pads that I have here, and all you got to do is touch it and the damn thing collapses right there in front of you.

Didn't exist. A facade, an illusion. Fiction. All right, well it was a real company, folks. And one of the first thing -- and he took some of the money that he made as a barber and he formed this company. And one of the first things that Take Down Records did, and this is no fiction, this is no fantasy, was they promoted a concert at the Spectrum.

And I know not all you folks are from Philadelphia,

Page 40

but there's a place right at the end of Broad Street, the Spectrum, a big place they used to play basketball there until they built another stadium, but it was called the Spectrum.

And they produced a rap concert. Beanie Sigel was there, I don't know if you know him, but he's a fairly renowned local rapper. There's a guy named Jay Zee who's a big time rapper up in New York, he ran what used to be called Rockefeller Records. Again, I don't know much about this, but apparently it's a big deal.

Five thousand people showed up to this concert. Five thousand people. After that -- so they sold ticket for that.

Alton also sold what are called backstage passes.

Okay? So if you wanted to go backstage, if you're sponsoring the event, you can go backstage. At any concert, it's a big deal to go backstage with the artists. They sold backstage passes, so people could get back there.

After the concert took place, he hosted what's called an after party. An after party is where basically all the people who promoted the event or starred in the event, that kind of stuff, they go to a club. The club's called Evolution. You charge money to get in the club.

So he went and did the after party. Now he's making money from this stuff, okay? Cash money. So he did that with Take Down Records. Guess what else Take Down Records does?

They actually record albums. Rap albums. Now they are not

Page 41

sold in the Tower Records Store.

What they do, is they take local rap artists who want to record and cut an album, they put it out on a CD and they actually sell this stuff on the street. Okay? They actually sell this stuff on the street.

But they actually recorded music. They actually recorded albums. What else did Alton Coles do?

Well starting in 2002 and continuing up until 2005, he hosted weekly parties at a place called the Palmer's Social Club.

And you will hear evidence from one source or another that, on average, four to six hundred people showed up every Friday night to go to these parties. Now what happens? They pay a \$15 cover charge. That's fifteen bucks a head for four to six hundred people.

Sometimes it was higher than six hundred. They had a rental arrangement with the owner of the club that basically said, if you get more than eight hundred people inside this club, you don't have to pay me any rent. But if it's less than 800, around 600, you got to give me \$2,000.

All right? And sometimes they didn't have to pay rent, and sometimes they did. But on average, four to six hundred people would show up every Friday night to go to these parties. Now in these parties they'd have a disc jockey in there and people would come in and they'd pay their \$15 cover

Page 42

charge.

Well I am terrible at math, so you'll be seeing me use a calculator during many portions of this trial. But all you got to do is multiply four to six hundred by the number fifteen, which is fifteen bucks a head, which is what it costs to get in there, and that's what they were bringing in in cash.

Cash. Now is he reporting this cash to the IRS? No, he is not. He is not doing that. He is keeping it. He is not paying taxes on it. Confess, we are guilty of not declaring income on tax returns. We're guilty of not filing tax returns. You'd of thought that they took the entire criminal code a charged my client with it.

The only thing left out of this is tax fraud, tax evasion. He's not charged with that. He is not charged with that, but that's essentially what he's doing. Getting large sums of cash, selling these rap albums, he's hosting these parties. And, by the way, on some of these parties during the holidays every four years or so, I mean, he could bring home as much as ten thousand a night in cash.

Ten thousand. Let's say he would average on Friday night anywhere between five to seven thousand dollars in his pocket. Multiply that by four. Okay?

I'm not going to do the math, because I'll screw it up, but you get the idea. All right? Then you multiply that by twelve. And that shows you what he's bringing in in cash on

Page 43

an annual basis. Then multiply that up until 2002 to 2005 and you get some idea of the kind of cash he's bringing in through hosting these parties.

Now what else did Take Down do? Take Down was also involved in the production of videos. A video. I don't know if it's correct or referred to it as an MTV video, but it was a video and it was shot like a movie. I mean, they literally shot it like a movie and it was called -- and they loved this folks, they love it. It was called New Jack City, The Next Generation.

Now I don't know if any of you all have actually seen the original movie New Jack City, but it was a movie that starred a fellow named Wesley Snipes. And the entire premise of the movie follows this character Wesley Snipes, and note I said character, because Wesley Snipes really wasn't what he pretended to be in the movie.

But it chronicles the rise of Wesley Snipes, as a gun toting, violent, drug dealing, drug kingpin. In this movie, however, starred him. It was called New Jack City, the Next Generation. And they filmed it and they shot it and they also distributed that video.

That was some of the way that my client used to make money. Now what else was he doing? This wiretap that they keep talking about, basically a wiretap is where they go up to a Federal Judge and say, Judge, can we listen to this person's

Page 44

telephone conversations? And the Judge reads what they put in the paperwork, and if the Judge believes there's good reason to let them do it, the Judge says, okay, you can go and do it.

So what happens is, they get a judge to say it's all right to listen to the telephone conversations that Alton's having with different people.

So they tap the phone. This starts on May 19th, 2005 and it goes up until August 10th, 2005. And it starts out with one telephone and then they get permission to do a second telephone. And they're listening to this stuff and they're listening to these calls and, you know, admittedly my client, Alton's on the phone talking to this fellow Jamar Campbell, and Jamar Campbell had just gotten busted, and he had got caught with a gun.

And Jamar Campbell's wondering what he should do, and Alton is giving him advice. Telling him what he should do.

Telling him how he should handle the situation.

Jamar wants to get his drugs back. He's giving him advice, telling him how to do it. You're going to hear multiple instances in which my client is talking to people who deal drugs. Around people who deal drugs. And they're going to ask you from that to infer that, boy, he must be a drug dealer, too.

No, folks. That's part of the culture in which he was born. That is what is depicted in the New Jack City video

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 45

that he shot, and produced, and starred in. That is the
reality that he is putting on film. And guess what he's doing
during this time period that they've got the wiretap in place?

Do you want to know what?

Shooting another movie. This one's called Menace.

There was an earlier movie, you know, they kept taking stuff from the '90's and redoing it. But there was an earlier movie called Menace to Society.

Well they're doing another one called Menace. All right? And some of these conversations that the Government says are so damning, are so probative, dead bang, flat-out proof of guilt, is actually him discussing props that are going to be used in these movies.

What do you think these movies are about? The drug culture. They are about people who deal drugs. They are about the culture that he's involved in. That he grew up in. But it's not a part of the way the Government says he's a part of it. There's a saying that, sometimes life imitates art, or art imitates life. I don't know which way it is. I don't know whether or not I got it right.

But what they're basically saying is, in some of these movies where he's dumb in movie about selling drugs, selling drugs in West Philadelphia, playing a character, okay. They basically believe that those movies, those productions, were actually art imitating life.

Page 46

Well they're right in one respect, okay. It was an art form and it was imitating life, just not his life. It was fiction. All right?

It was art imitating somebody else's life, not his.

All right? Now how does the Government transform Alton into a fairly successful, young and up and coming member of the entertainment industry? How do you transform him into a drug kingpin?

Well, they're going to rely primarily upon three things. And I'm leaving out the stuff that was found in the search, and we'll go into that. All right. It will go into it in the evidence, but in some of these films, guess what you see? Money counters. Ooh. Why? Because drug dealers use money counters. If you're making a movie about drug dealers, and you want it to be realistic, you're going to want to have the props.

So, yes, they found stuff in there. Now they didn't find any drugs in his house, but that's why they're trying to say he's responsible for all these other houses. But put that aside and deal with it individually, but primarily you're going to have three forms of evidence here.

Tapes. What are the tapes? That's where the Judge said, okay, you can record his conversations. So they're going to have these tapes and they're going to say, boy, look at this, this is really, really bad stuff.

Page 47

All right? Well take a close look at the tapes, all right? Does he use slang, jargon? Sure. I'm not standing up here telling you he doesn't know drug jargon, he doesn't know drug slang. He's making movies about it, realistic movies about it, of course, he knows it. Of course he knows people that are involved in it. But that doesn't make him part of that particular business.

That doesn't transform him into a kingpin. Some of the tapes are references to props they're using in the movie they are filming at that time. Menace -- I think it was called Menace. It may be Menace to Society, but Menace, because they're filming a movie and you'll hear about this on the tapes.

And we'll deal with the tapes individually, as they come up. What else are they going to have? They're going to have expert witnesses. Ooh, expert witnesses. Man, that sounds impressive doesn't it?

Expert witnesses. And what are these expert witnesses going to say? Well these expert witnesses are law enforcement types. They're basically federal agents. And these federal agents are going to get up there and say, you know, I've been doing this for a long, long time.

And, you know, every time I hear the phrase -- some of the phrases they use in this case are superman. Well that's a reference for drugs. Little boy, that's a reference for

Page 48

drugs. And then they're going to sit there and say, ah-ha, Alton's using those words. He must be a drug dealer.

They are describing props. But what the expert can't tell you, by the way, is what they really meant. Okay? What was in their head. He can't know that, he's not that good an expert.

He can't read somebody's mind, so he can't tell you what somebody actually meant. What somebody actually knew. They're going to bring up another expert. And an expert's going to get up there and explain to you folks how drug dealing operates. And I'm sure this expert's going to get up there and say, I have looked at everything the Government's provided me on Mr. Alton Coles, and, you know what, his entire lifestyle, everything he does is perfectly consistent with my understanding of the way drug dealers operate.

Well thank you very much. He doesn't know squat.

Okay? Really, he doesn't know squat. What he's doing is, he's telling you that I've looked at this stuff in the past, they all have the common characteristics, they got the common characteristics here, so he must be involved. But he really doesn't know. They're going to bring somebody up here to say, you know, I looked at the number of telephone calls between these people and they talk to each other a lot on cell phones.

And these were really short conversations. And based on my extensive experience and numerous criminal

Page 49

investigations, I can tell you that is consistent with drug dealing.

Well the problem with that is nobody is hearing those particular conversations. All he's really telling you is that they communicated with one another a lot. What's the bottom line? He really can't tell you what's going on.

He really can't. Because, again, one person cannot get up and tell you what somebody else knows, what somebody else is thinking.

So how are they going to put this case together, what's it really going to come down to? What's their primary proof? Well it's something like this. I bet you folks didn't know this, but in the past, oh, I don't know, eight, ten years or so, Philadelphia's become something of a factory town.

But, you know, we don't make cars and we don't make appliances, or radios, or anything like that. You know, we manufacture cooperating witnesses. And there is a production facility at 7th and Arch.

And it spits them out in assembly line fashion, one after another. And what is a cooperating witness? You briefly heard Mr. Bresnick allude to it. A cooperating witnesses is somebody who is in a whole lot of trouble.

Somebody typically facing a substantial, substantial term of imprisonment. Somebody who is typically held without bail from the moment they're arrested and charged. And where

Page 50

are they taken? They're taken to a place called the Federal Detention Center.

And it's right here behind us at the corner of 7th and Arch. And they sit there and they begin to look at the charges, and they know they've got prior convictions. And the more convictions you got, the higher the sentences go.

And they begin to think that they're caught red handed. There's no way out of this. Ah, but there is a way. There is a way out of this.

You enter into a cooperation deal with the Government. You know how you get out from under some of these horrendous sentences that you look at in Federal Court? I mean, some of these guys could be looking at life in prison. There is no parole in the Federal system.

So when you're looking at life in prison, and you're caught red handed, and you've done multiple drug deals that are on tape, that are surveilled, that you cannot get out of, unless you cut a deal with these guys, your only way out of prison is with a toe tag.

Because you will die in jail. That's what these guys are looking at. And what do they do? They decide to take a lifeline. And the lifeline comes from these people here.

Because the way the law works, and you'll hear a lot more about this, but the way the law works is, the judge in many instances has got to impose a particular sentence. Usually a bad one, a

long one. And there's also what they call guidelines, or sentencing guidelines. And what they basically do is recommend

Page 51

sentencing guidelines. And what they basically do is recommend
to a judge what the people who wrote them think is an
appropriate term that you should be sent away for, and it's

usually a long long time.

But the Government, the way the sentencing laws work, if you help them out, join their team, so to speak, they can file paperwork, a piece of paper with the judge, that says, judge, this guy helped us out, he provided substantial assistance.

And if the Government files that piece of paper, the judge's hands are untied. No longer have to send the person away for potentially life.

Thirty years, forty years. That's how they get out from under these sentences. That is what I suspect each and every cooperating witness that is going to be brought here in front of you has done in this case.

Now I'm kind of at a disadvantage, and my colleagues are as well. Because we don't know who these cooperating witnesses are. I listened very closely to Mr. Bresnick's opening and he didn't mention them by name.

Just referred to people who lived with him. I think I know one, and I'll talk about her in a second. But people who lived with him, people who were involved with him. We don't know who they are.

Page 52

Normally, I could stand up here -- and quite frankly, I don't know at this point what they have said about my client. See, normally I would get up here and I would say, well, I've seen statements from these people. I've seen the plea agreements that they have with the Government.

I know what they were looking at in terms of sentence. And I know what tremendous incentive or motivation they have to keep these fellows happy over here.

I don't know who their witnesses are. They haven't told me yet. So I can't predict, or stand up here and tell you what it is I think they're going to say, or what our response is to whatever it is they're going to say.

Now a week before these witnesses testify, I'm going to be told who they are. And I'm going to figure out what it is they're going to say.

The only reason I'm going into this right now is, please do not draw any negative inference or hold it against us because I cannot anticipate what these folks are going to say because, quite frankly, I don't know who they are yet.

But I guarantee you this, okay. I guarantee you, with the exception of one, their accommodations are at the Federal Detention Center over there. They have plea agreements with the Government. They were facing substantial terms of imprisonment.

They were probably caught red handed on multiple drug

Page 53

transactions, have prior convictions, and are facing horrendous sentences. They're really put in a box and they have no choice. The only choice they have is to cooperate with these folks.

Do you know what else you're going to hear about this Federal Detention Center? You're going to hear, and it's amazing, but they also like to say typically, well, you know, our witnesses, they don't communicate with each other. So if witness A is saying the same thing as witness B and they're not communicating to each other, well it must be true, because they're saying the same thing.

Well over at this place, the Federal Detention

Center, they have a unique communication system. It is called, hollering through the bowl. Okay? And you want to know how it works? Let's say you're up on the fifth floor, and you want to communicate with somebody down on the third floor, you go right to the corner of your cell, you flush the toilet and you start screaming into the plumbing system.

You can communicate with somebody down on the third floor, who, in turn, can relay a message to somebody else.

Sometimes they are put on the same block as one another.

So there are ways for these people to communicate.

And we will explore, in sometimes vivid detail, exactly how it works. Hollering through the bowl, and a concept, which I'm going to start this trial out and introduce you to, it is

Page 54

called case jumping.

What is case jumping? Well over in that building over there, you got a whole bunch of people who are caught red handed. And they're looking for ways out of these sentences. The best way to get out is testify. I'm a witness. See not a to of people go to trial.

But when you find one who is, it's like a feeding frenzy. You jump on the case. You try and get that sentence reduction. That's the mentality you're dealing with over there. You take human beings, you catch them red handed, you put them in a situation to where they're either locked up for the rest of their life or for most of their lives and you say, the only way you can realistically get out of this is to provide evidence against another human being.

What do you think they're going to do? They're going to look for every conceivable opportunity they find to get themselves out of trouble and get themselves out of jail, regardless of what it takes.

Those are the people that the Government are going to be bringing in here to you. Those are the people that the Government are going to use to transform him into this drug -- gun toting, violent, drug dealing -- all that stuff he said.

All right. They come into this courtroom with a lot of baggage.

Now I do know one of them. One cooperating witness

Page 55

is a young lady named Kristina Latney. And Kristina Latney is the mother of my client's son, Naseem. And on August 10, 2005, the FBI swooped in, like he said, they fanned out all over the place, and they went in like Sherman tanks, or the Blitzkrieg in Nazi Germany, they went in and they knocked down everything, and they went into this house and they found guns, and they found, I think it was about a hundred thousand dollars.

All right? But I already told you, he makes a lot of cash from these parties he's hosting and some of the activities they claim do not exist, all fiction. All right?

That happens about 6:00 in the morning. Six thirty.

Now Kristina Latney is scared. Justifiably so. The Federal

Government just busted down her door, went in there. There are

firearms in there. There's cash in there.

And she sits down and she says she wants to cooperate and help out the Government. And she proceeds to give a 33 page statement. Now most of this statement is her basically agreeing to what the agents say. Okay?

The agent's saying, well Take Down Records, that was a shell company that Alton used to launder his drug proceeds, right?

Well they try and get her to say that, but it ain't coming out exactly right. So he asked the question about three or four times and finally the agent just says, this is a shell company that was formed for Alton to launder money, he calls

Page 56

him Ace, by the way, for Ace to launder money? And she's like, um-hum, yeah. All right. That's basically the way her statement goes down.

Now what she actually testifies to here at trial, we'll have to wait and see. But they took a scared young woman who basically was found with firearms in there, who doesn't know what to do and is worried about her kids, gave her reason to believe that she might be in trouble. And she essentially agreed to what these fellows were saying.

That I know is at least one witness that they're going to have testify against Alton.

There are supposedly six others. You know, two weeks ago there was only four of these, what I call mystery witnesses. It's not really a mystery. They're somewhere on this indict -- maybe they are on this indictment, maybe not. Okay?

Remember what I said about case jumping, you start seeing fellows that are not on this indictment all of a sudden show up here and testify, jumping on a case, trying to get out of trouble.

But a couple of weeks ago, it was just 4. Okay?

Last week it was six. It sounds like two new converts to the fold have decided to become cooperating witnesses in the last week or so. Again, I don't know.

We're just going to have to wait and see. And I am

almost done here. Let me tell you a couple of things we don't dispute. Did he possess weapons? Yes. Yes. He possessed weapons. He did. He sure did. That is not the issue in the case. The issue in the case is, why did he have the weapons? Did he have the weapons because he was leaving clubs at 2, 2:30 in the morning with five, six, seven thousand dollars in cash and didn't want to be robbed? That's what we say.

Page 57

And, again, I don't have to prove it. But that's what we say. Or did he have it because the Government says it was to protect his drug empire? The issue is not, did he have the guns, the issue is, why did he have the guns.

He certainly possessed weapons. But why did he possess them? The Government's got to show you it was to protect drugs and in furtherance of drug dealing and in relation to etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. The Government's got to prove to you that it involved drugs.

That's why he had the guns. Not for self protection, to prevent him from getting robbed of cash, that he was getting by hosting some of these parties. Did he try to hide stuff from the IRS by putting it in other people's names? Yes, he sure did.

The Government says it wasn't to prevent him from having to pay taxes on it and that kind of stuff. No, no, no it had nothing to do with that. The Government says it was to launder, hide, drug proceeds.

Page 58

So the issue is not, did he put stuff in other people's names. Okay? That's not the issue. The issue is, why did he do it. Did he do it to launder, or hide, disguise drug proceeds? That's what they say. Or did he just not want the IRS knowing that he was making large sums of cash?

Or, sometimes, was this stuff put in other people's names because he couldn't get credit? They say it's to hide drug proceeds, we say to keep money from the IRS and because sometimes he couldn't get credit. Which I think you'll find, by the way, when they bought that house in New Jersey, part of the reason his name disappeared from it, is because he couldn't get credit.

All right, that was part of the problem. Okay. But we don't dispute that. Did he know and associate with individuals who were involved in dealing drugs, drug dealing? Yes, admitted. Okay? Take that out of the equation. He sure did. Okay? But you folks are going to sit there and associate and stand next to each other for months, okay?

But just because you associate with one another does not make you responsible for what the other person has done. Same thing works in the law.

Hanging around with somebody, knowing somebody, associating with somebody, especially if part of its trying to produce realistic motion pictures, does not make you part of the business that that other person is involved in.

Page 59

No more than it made Wesley Snipes an actual drug kingpin, or Denzel Washington an American Gangster, just because he starred in the movie, did research on it. It is a film. With respect to him, it is fiction. It is an art form, and to some extent it did, it did reflect, chronicle, photograph and film life, real life.

Which is very harsh, it is a harsh reality, but it's not his life. And I suggest to you that the only way you can come to a contrary conclusion, is if you agree and find credible the cooperating witnesses that have been churned out at the factory behind us.

I suggest to you that they're not going to be worthy of belief. They are not going to provide the type of evidence that would allow you to find beyond a reasonable doubt that he is what this book says, minus the 25 million bucks, and what these witnesses say.

I want to thank you for your time and I'll see you when the trial's over and I get to talk to you again.

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, you have been sitting for about an hour and a half, we're going to take a ten minute recess. Go out and relax, and we will hear the balance of the opening statements.

(Jury Exits Courtroom)

(Recess)

THE COURT: Mr. McMahon?

Page 60

Good afternoon. Let me reintroduce myself, since it was a long time ago since we all met. My name is Jack McMahon. I'm an attorney in Philadelphia. And as I said in the beginning of today, I represent Timothy Baukman, seated just to

MR. MCMAHON: Yes, thank you, Your Honor.

my left there during the course of the trial.

But I think the first obligation that any lawyer standing before a jury should fulfill, and that is to thank them. Because it's real easy to thank somebody after a trial and the verdict goes whichever particular way you want it to go and then you thank them. Oh, thank you very much, I appreciate it, you went my way.

But that's not the purpose of my thanking you at this point in time. Because you people, particularly you people in this particular jury, are going to be sitting for a significant period of time.

Many jurors will sit for a week, four or five days.

Even two weeks, sometimes. But you are going to be longer than that. So on behalf of Mr. Baukman and myself, and Mr. Baukman's family, we thank you ahead of time. Whatever your verdict is in this case, we appreciate your service.

Taking time from your family, your jobs and your, just day-to-day lives to come here every single day, and some of you from great distances.

And I truly mean it when I say we appreciate it.

Page 61

Because whatever you do in this case, whatever you do in this case will be the right thing, because that is our system.

Our system is that the collective minds of this jury will do the right thing, will do the fair thing, and will do the just thing. And when you leave this building for the last time, weeks from now, and you walk back out onto Market Street and go about your regular life, each and everyone of you should be proud of yourself.

Whatever your verdict is in the case, you should be proud of yourselves, because you did a service, an extraordinary service, whatever your verdict is.

So, again, preliminarily, thank you. Now the Government, these are opening statements, and opening statements are not supposed to be arguments or -- those will come later when we have a opportunity to give our closing arguments after evidence.

These are statements where we're trying to say what you will hear, what you won't hear in a particular case. And the Government went first and Mr. Bresnick gave a presentation of what he intends and what he hopes to prove.

And as Mr. Warren pointed out, the Government that brought this case has extraordinary power, they have extraordinary resources. They have extraordinary manpower. You've heard all the ones just pointed out to here in this courtroom here today. And that's just the tip of the iceberg

Page 62

of the people that they have access to that they used through the course of this investigation.

And they've used wiretaps, they've used search warrants. They've used all the various resources of the Federal Government over a significant period of time to try to bring a case to you that's going to have a quality and a reliability that will enable you to convict any or all of the defendants.

So and they've had that ability, and they used that ability in this particular case over a year period of time.

And I say that to you, because I think it's important, when you look at this case, and what you're really going to hear and not and, as Mr. Bresnick in his opening stood before all of these defendants, and stood before them as if -- and pointed at them and walked around the room pointing at them, as if that was some sort of evidence.

As if that was some sort of dramatic effect. That that was -- they're more serious about the case, because he could walk around the room, because he's these men are just seated there, and he can point at each and everyone of them and I suggest to you to, attempt to degrade them in some fashion by pointing at these men sitting here, who have no other recourse by to have Mr. Bresnick put his finger in their faces.

Well it's not about finger pointing, it's not about Mr. Bresnick putting his finger in their faces. That means

Page 63

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22.

23

24

25

The case is about evidence. And the case is about quality of evidence. And the case is about credible evidence. And I want you to remember those words through the course of

nothing. That's showmanship. And it's kind of rude, really.

the next few weeks. Quality of evidence and credibility of evidence. Because those are the buzzwords that the Government did not talk about.

They talked about all the buzzwords that Mr. Warren talked about. But the words I want you to remember are quality and credibility. Quality means just that. The worth from that testimony. Credibility means, the believability of that testimony.

And I want you to understand something. Government began this investigation of my client, and, remember, I represent Timothy Baukman. The fellow seated right They started this investigation in August of 2004. there.

And they continued investigating, what they have told you here today is a major drug organization, for over a year period of time, with all the resources of the Federal Government.

Surveillance, video cameras, pictures, wiretaps, pen registers to detect phone calls. All the science that is available in 2004 and 2005 in this country.

And according to them, this is a major, major organization. And according to them, my client Timothy Baukman

Page 64

was a high player in this. And Mr. Baukman was, as Mr. Bresnick said, second in command, or the first lieutenant, or something to that effect.

So it would seem then, that if that's correct, that if in fact that's true, and they have all these resources, and they have all this ability to investigate, that they're going to come forward with real quality evidence and credible evidence against Mr. Baukman.

Well I suggest that's not what's going to happen.

When evidence is presented in a criminal case against a

defendant, it's going to come in certain form. This is a drug

case. So what is one of the things that one would expect to

see in a drug case? Drugs.

You're going to expect to see my client, a supposedly a major mover and shaker of kilos and bricks, and cocaine and over a year period of time. Moving it, selling it, disposing of it quickly, getting rid of it. And he's the second in command.

Well with all the resources of the Government, you are not going to hear, you are not going to hear one single drug transaction that Tim Baukman was involved in. You're not going to see the drugs were transferred by him, in his possession, in his hands where he handed them to an undercover agent.

Where he handed them somebody else. Where he was

Page 65

surveilled carrying a package that alleged to be drugs.

Anything at all that even remotely resembles the fundamental part of this case, and that is drugs. They are not going to be able to place that into the hands of Timothy Baukman, and yet they watched him all the time for a year.

For a year, with the full power of the Government and they did not have a drug that they're going to put up there that they can associate to Timothy Baukman. How can that be, if in fact he was this player that they say he was?

Is the Government unable to do that? They can't do that with all their power, with all their skills, with all their technology they can't give you one scintilla of evidence with this major player having drugs, holding drugs, around drugs. Nothing.

They're going to present to you tapes, tapes. Now one would think, if he's the second in command of any organization, whether it be IBM, a drug organization, whether it be anything, if you are able to get inside the power structure of the two major players, Mr. Coles and Mr. Baukman, that you're going to hear a lot of talk about what the purpose of their organization is.

Drugs. If you're listening to them each and everyday, for five months, it's going to be real simple to determine through the tapes that you hear, because they're going to be talking about money and drugs, and where to move it

Page 66

and where we got to have it and -- every single day, because this is an organization, this is a business, as Mr. Bresnick said.

And business needs to talk everyday. And the head guy has to talk to the second guy, and there has to be things moved and things arranged, and money to be paid, and things to be done, in a business.

And they had those tapes, and they had conversations.

And none of them, none of them are going to have anything,
anything remotely resembling what you would expect to hear, if,
in fact, the defendant, Timothy Baukman, was the second in
command of this 25 million dollar drug operation.

Listen for those tapes, and see if that backs up what they're saying, that there is this second in command of any organization, much less a 25 million dollar drug organization.

They're going to present to you, as Mr. Warren stated, cooperating witnesses. And I don't like to call them cooperating witnesses, it's too sanitary and too clean. It gives them an air of of integrity that I don't suggest they deserve.

Cooperating means like, well we're just helping out.

Cooperating. Well I suggest to you what they are, what they really are, and what you're going to hear when you hear the testimony of these individuals who Mr. Warren aptly pointed, we don't know who they are at this point. What you're going to

hear are that they are miscreants.

Page 67

They are low life's, they are rats, they are skunks.

They are not cooperating witnesses. You know, there's an old saying, that desperate men, do desperate things.

And these are truly, truly low life, miscreant, desperate men. And you take low life, low character, miscreant, desperate men, and you put a situation where their lives are at stake, their lives are at stake. Their ability to walk around free ever again is at stake.

And to take their statements that they say to protect themselves from that as reliable and credible, as I said earlier, strains commonsense and strains you good people's understanding of human nature.

There's an old saying also that, you could have the friendliest of dogs, and you can have a dog that you -- never bite, never bite. But, you know what, if you corner that dog, if you get that dog into a corner and leave it no other options, he has no other place to go, that friendly dog, that otherwise friendly dog, will do, what? He'll bite. Because it's his only way out. It's his only way out.

And that's exactly the type of people you're going to hear from in this case. Exactly the type of individuals you're going to hear. You're going to hear people, not of quality, as I said. Remember the buzzwords? Not of credibility.

You're going to hear people of the lowest of

Page 68

character, of desperate men, of dogs who will bite, of rats, skunks and low life's.

That's what they are. They're not cooperating witnesses. They're going to have surveillance pictures.

Potentially, videos. They're going to have all these things over a year period of time.

And I want you to listen very carefully and watch very carefully to see all the times that they put drugs into the hands of the second in command of this major drug organization.

And do you know how many times they're going to do that through those types of evidence? Zero. Zero. Over a year period of time. A year. You'd think one time they could get something, to have drugs on this investigation, but they don't.

This is a situation where Mr. Bresnick has said to you, and pointed at my client and said that he hid all these assets. And when you hear that, you have a knee jerk reaction that he hid all these assets in all these names and made it seem as if there's a substantial situation going on where he's hiding assets.

Well it's just not true. That's just not the evidence that you're going to hear. You're going to hear that Tim Baukman owns no properties. Not in his name, not in anybody's name. So don't get fooled as if he's some landlord

Page 69

that has, or property owner that has properties in his girlfriend, or son's, or anybody -- he owns no properties, this second in command.

He rents an apartment in the Germantown Section of Philadelphia, with his girlfriend. Rents it. He owns no other assets. He had a car. This Jaguar that the Government pointed to. It was a '99 -- 1999 Jaguar that he liked, that he paid for by financing. And you'll see the checks in this case of \$580.59 that he paid for, every month, for his car.

A 1999 Jaguar. That's the extent of the assets that they are going to show as to Mr. Baukman. They went one further, they said he had \$25,000 cash when they raided his house -- or apartment, it's not even a house, it's the apartment that he rents with his girlfriend.

Obviously, that's accurate. But you heard, and not to go over it in much more detail than Mr. Warren indicated, but you're going to hear that he was in fact partners with Mr. Coles. And he was partners with Mr. Coles in this Take Down Records. And you're going to hear much of how they did make cash.

Much of it Mr. Warren already indicated. For example, that after party that was made after the hip hop at the Spectrum, that was exclusively, the rights to that was to Timothy Baukman. And they paid a hundred dollars, they made --- he made almost \$70,000 cash at that after party.

Page 70

They set -- they set up parties for an investment banker one time and filmed it. And there's actually, the Government seized the photo, and made money on that. They had all these parties, and these holiday parties. So this was a cash situation that they were in that they were making. Take Down Records wasn't a situation where they got checks necessarily, although they were financed and how they did their work.

But they would sell these videos to stores, to mom and pop stores, and they would get cash for it. It wasn't like -- they would sell ten of them to the corner store to be sold and they would get ten dollars for each of them, they would get a hundred dollars cash. They sold approximately 10,000 of these. So there was cash available to them. So the fact that he may have had \$25,000 cash in an apartment that he rented, is not so odd and so surprising, when you consider the nature of the work that he did in the business that he did.

Mr. Baukman's a 31-year-old young man, graduated Overbrook High School. He has one child who, you heard about from Mr. Bresnick, Tauheed, and his girlfriend Tiffany. And they rented that apartment. He -- his trade for a period of time was heating and air conditioning.

He took -- after graduating high school, took classes at CHI, which is a trade school, to learn heating and air conditioning and worked in that field for a while.

Page 71

Then he got into this hip hop records and Take Down and making videos and CD's and whatnot, and that's where he spent most of his time over the last few years.

So this is a situation where they did have cash, where they did do these things. And Mr. Baukman has not hidden secret assets at all. And, yes, the car was in the name of his son, Tauheed.

And, yes, the apartment on Essex Avenue was in the name of Tauheed Baukman. And the Government has told you that he did this in some attempt to hide all his assets from the Government.

Well how absurd is that proposition, to put it in your son's name, who's about 8 or 9 years old, and be writing the checks out of that account, to think somehow the Government wouldn't be able to trace that to you. And that was some kind of sophisticated plan to hide assets from the United States Government, is absurd.

The reason that it was in that name, and the reason why the apartment was in that name, was because, similar to Mr. Coles, Mr. Baukman did not have good credit. And to purchase the Jaguar under his name, he would not have had the ability with using his name to get the financing to pay \$580.59 a month. So it was put into another name, his son's name, who came up clean, as far as credit's concerned, and he was able to finance the car.

The apartment on Essex Avenue was put in that name, also for the same reasons. Apartment buildings want people with decent credit. They put it in a different name. Although he paid it under his son's name all the time. But there are no other hidden assets, there are no other secret things put into girlfriend's name, hidden names, money, safe deposit boxes. Nothing of the sort.

Page 72

So if he is partners in a 25 million dollar drug operation, as the Government says in their case, then the asset analysis of Mr. Baukman does not corroborate, or suggest, in any way, shape or form that that's true. Because as I said before, these are the only things that he possessed.

Now Mr. Bresnick told you that this location at Essex Avenue was, in his words, were a treasure trove. And indicated that this was in Baukman's son's name as a location that he controlled.

Well, true, he did pay for the rent on the premises of 339 East Essex. And that's true. And the reason that -- and he had that for a long time, back from 2001. And he lived there once, a long time ago. And basically lived there a period of time for a couple of weeks in 2001, I believe, when he was having some rift with his girlfriend at the time.

But he didn't live there. He lived at 22967 (sic)
School House Lane with his girlfriend Tiffany. That location,
which the treasure trove, as Mr. Bresnick has indicated to you,

there.

is not a place where he resided, although he paid the rent through his son's account, for the purposes I've already stated, it is not a location that he resided in. It was not a location that he really had dominion and control over. It's not a location where he was aware of the items that were in

Page 73

The person that resided there and stayed there was his cousin, his cousin, Dante Tucker, who is a name that you heard in this case. Dante Tucker had come out of prison in April of 2005, and needed a place to stay. And he had his cousin staying from time at 339 East Essex Street, because it's a place that he had available to him and was paying the rent for. So Dante Tucker, in fact, was living there at the time of the search of August the 10th of 2005.

And my client was living at 2967 School House Lane. There is nothing else in this case that will tie my client to dominion, control, knowledge, or any of the items that are found within 339 East Essex.

And if you want to speak to the person that knows what is in 339 East Essex, it's not the person paying the rent, it's the person that's staying there and living there, and that's one Dante Tucker.

They do go and search my client's house, 2967 School House Lane. And you would think, if he is this major participant in a big drug business, that you're going to find

Page 74

something. They find no drugs, no paraphernalia, no nothing to suggest he's involved in any drug activity in any way, shape or form, other than the \$25,000 cash, which I have already previously talked to you about.

The only tape that Mr. Bresnick referred to when it came to my client, was a tape in which he pointed as to some powerful tape. Now I remind you, this is a first assistant in this major drug operation, and the only tape Mr. Bresnick referred to in his opening, was a tape in which he's sitting there laughing, and you'll hear the tape. It's a tape dated May the 26th of 2005, in which -- the tape is where Dante Tucker, who, as I told you had been out of jail, the one that's staying at Essex, and that person failed the drug test, because he was on parole.

And he was laughing about it. This is his cousin.

He's heard on tape laughing about it, saying what he should have done to protect himself from not doing what he was doing, so he could pass that drug test. And that's all he says. And that's the tape that they point to, after five months of tapes, after a year investigation, laughing at his cousin failing a drug test is the one thing that Bresnick -- Mr. Bresnick announces to you as evidence that he's involved as a first assistant in a major drug operation.

Well you listen to those tapes and see if you, listening and working backwards, making the assumption that he

Page 75

is, in fact, the first lieutenant, is in fact the major participant in a drug organization, and listen backwards, and see if that's the type of conversation that you would expect to hear from the second in command of a 25 million dollar drug operation.

I suggest to you that those tapes will not back that up. They will not present you with the quality or credibility of evidence that is necessary to convict any individual in this country today.

Take Down Records was real. He talks about it like it was a shell. This was a real operation. These were young men that were trying to do something in this operation of Take Down Records. They actually made CD's. They actually had rappers. This isn't just, they made this company up and then there was nothing going on.

No, it wasn't the biggest record company in America. It was some young men that were trying, they were moving forward, they were trying to do things that would advance them on. That was my client's goal, that was his dream. He got involved in that hip hop culture, and hip hop rapping, and hip hop movies. And he wanted to be a mover and shaker. He wanted to be a producer of individuals.

And that's what he was trying to do with himself during this period of time, and that's why you'll hear some of the tapes talking about that. In fact, the second one, Menace,

is a play or story that he actually participated in writing, because he was interested in getting in on that aspect of the movie business, of writing these movies.

Page 76

So it was real. It's not some shell. It's not some bogus name, only where they just funnel money in. They made CD's, they had rappers. They made one film. They did distribute one film. They did have contracts. They did sell videos. They did sell CD's. So to sit there and tell you all that this is just some shell with no reality to it, that's just not fair, because it's not the facts of this case.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I think it's time, I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time talking to you, because I think it's important for the evidence to begin.

But in conclusion to you, I ask you to promise to me one thing, and Mr. Warren touched on it briefly, but I think it's really important. You have to promise to me that you will really keep an open mind when it comes to my client Timothy Baukman. That you won't have a knee jerk reaction. That you won't assume anything and make any conclusions until the end of this case.

Because to do so based on speeches, and to do so based on innuendo and guesswork and stereotypes, just wouldn't be fair. It just wouldn't be American to do that.

So I'm asking you to honestly do that for me, as best you can, within the constraints of human nature, and to do

that. And I think, with the end of this case, the end of the case, when we've come back to talk to you on behalf of Mr.

Baukman, I'll be able to say to you, that after a one year investigation, they've had no drug transactions, no drug sales, no wiretaps of any significance for a five-month investigation.

Page 77

Only cooperating witnesses, nothing of any substance. And what I started my statement to you, nothing of quality and very little of credibility. And what you will find at that point in time, that your verdict should be at that time, not quilty, because it's not proven. Thank you.

THE COURT: Counsel.

MR. POWELL: Thank you, Judge. Please the Court.

Counsel. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You know from the introductions that I represent Mr. James Morris, who is one of the defendants in this trial, along with Mr. Ronald Thompson.

You've had a opportunity to listen to lawyers talking to you for about the last 3 or 4 hours. I'm sure you've had quite enough of it. So I'm going to try and be somewhat brief with you. But this is really not the kind of case where any lawyer who talks to you can really be short.

This is all very interesting here. It's actually all a little bit overwhelming. If you take a look in this courtroom, you see all of the great technology that the Government has developed. They've got really nice pictures.

They got a great graph, they got all sorts of folks

who sit back here, and laptops, and make these nice things come up for you. You got the case agents, who sit here in the courtroom, they're handsome guys. Hair nicely cut. Neat, wearing their neckties. The kind of people that you look at and you say to yourself, these are folks who seem to know what they're doing.

Page 78

These are guys who seem trustworthy. Mr. Bresnick had a opportunity to address you and he told you in his opening statement, because that's what this part of the proceeding is, what it is that the Government intends to prove to you during the course of this case. The Judge told you in his preliminary instruction that the verdict that you come to has to be based upon the evidence. That probably seems like it's fairly obvious.

But once you have a opportunity to hear the presentation by the Government, once you have an opportunity to hear from other lawyers in the case, that can get just a little bit murky.

Because as you could see, Mr. Bresnick is a pretty charismatic guy. All fire and brimstone. And he's matched by Mr. Warren, who seems to be up to the task of being equally fiery.

There's a courtroom full of guys who are sort of really big shot, sophisticated lawyers in this room. I remember growing up in Philadelphia. And as a kid, we used to

Page 79

watch the Channel 6 news. And you'd see those news stories about the trials at the Federal Courthouse, with all of the big shot criminal lawyers.

The guys like Bobby Simone and all of the other guys that you'd see, and read and hear about. And when you come into a courtroom like this, this is sort of the same environment, isn't it? I'm just a poor kid from the ghetto. I'm not a big shot lawyer like these fine gentlemen that you see sitting here at the counsel table.

So all of this technology that you see and the fine speeches that you hear from Mr. Bresnick and others, a lot of that stuff's a little bit, sort of over my head.

But there are some things that I do know. I do know that it doesn't matter how sophisticated the Government's technology may be, the Judge says that the verdict that you come to at the end of this case has to be based upon the evidence.

Well what's the evidence in this case? Mr. Warren's right, there isn't any yet, because you haven't heard a single word of testimony from a single witness. There hasn't been a single exhibit offered in this case. There hasn't been anything provided to you that you can take with you back to your deliberations to decide whether or not the Government has proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt against Mr. Morris in this case.

But it doesn't say much to say that to you, because you'll get a opportunity to do all of those things. And during the next 7 or 8 weeks or so that you folks will be burdened with all of us, the Government will produce to you all of the things I'm sure that Mr. Bresnick said he would produce to you.

Page 80

They will produce witnesses, folks like the case agents, and the investigators, and the experts that were involve din the development of this case.

All nice, clean, Government employees. All guys who get paid to come in and make their best effort to help these nice gentlemen at the counsel table here to prove their cases against these folks at the counsel table back here.

And in an effort to do all of those things, they're going to bring to bear all of that technology that Mr. Bresnick had a opportunity to tell you about. The surveillance, the guys who went out and actually eyeballed what was going on in the neighborhoods.

The wiretaps, those electronic interceptions where they listened to conversations between people that they claim are involved in a criminal enterprise. Thousands and thousands of pages of documents.

Tons of pictures. Lots of records. So-called cooperating witnesses. All people who will come in and who are designed to put together a package that you can take with you back to your deliberations and decide that the Government has

Page 81

proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the allegations contained in what Mr. Warren described as the catalog in this case.

All of those things are really very nice, and sometimes they're even helpful. But many times they're not. Sometimes, ladies and gentlemen, this technology just sort of overwhelms the truth. And lots of times it really isn't very difficult to cut through the pieces of paper and the pictures and the cooperating witnesses and the opinions of experts who work for the Government, to get to the truth in this case.

In this case, Mr. Bresnick told you that back on August 8th, 2005 police officers who had been involved in a year-long investigation fanned out into different areas of Pennsylvania and other states, and executed search warrants and made arrests.

And he's right, that is what they did. And on August 8, 2005, among the places that the police came to was an address of 5 Burden Hill Drive, in Quinton, New Jersey. At 5 Burden Hill Drive, Mr. Bresnick tells you that they found a bunch of money, that they found a car parked in the driveway and inside the car was half a kilo of cocaine.

And that they found some other things. And he says to you, in the course of his opening statement, that that stuff belonged to that guy there. That the money was the proceeds of criminal conduct. That it was his house, and his drugs, and his vehicle that those things were found in.

Page 82

Evidence is a funny thing, ladies and gentlemen. Sometimes it confirms the arguments that lawyers make to you at the outset, and other times it refutes it.

When you have a opportunity to hear the actual evidence in this case, you're going to find that this guy didn't live at 5 Burden Hill Drive in Quinton, New Jersey, and the Government knows it. They know who owned the house at 5 Burden Hill Drive.

There was a truck in the driveway at 5 Burden Hill Drive that had half a kilo of cocaine, and Mr. Bresnick tells you. They also know that that guy wasn't the owner of the truck.

Now if they found \$500,000 in this house, does that mean that whoever owned, occupied, had contact with this house has committed a crime?

Only if having a lot of money's a crime. Having a lot of money is no more a crime than being poor. Where you get your money from may get you into trouble, depending on where it comes from. But the Government has to show that it came from something unlawful.

Now this is one of those kinds of cases, as you've heard from the other lawyers, where the Government's not going to place a great deal of reliance on direct evidence.

It's not because they don't want to, but because they don't have it. If there was actual evidence that the money

Page 83

found at 5 Burden Hill Drive was drug money, if there was direct testimony that could be offered to show that, the Government would give it to you. But they won't in this case, because it doesn't exist.

If there was direct evidence that the half kilo of cocaine found in the Suburban parked in the driveway was cocaine that was possessed or held by that guy, the Government would give it to you, because they'd want you to have it so that you could convict him beyond a reasonable doubt.

But they won't, because it doesn't exist in this case. And what you'll find in this case, ladies and gentlemen, is that a great deal of the Government's case is just the Government's wish list. It's the Government's speculations about people who are involved in things that the Government speculates that they were involved in.

Now it's a pretty tough proposition when you ask 12 people to convict someone beyond a reasonable doubt of a criminal offense based on speculation. Because the Judge will tell you, in the course of his instruction to you, that one of the things that you cannot do in this case, is you cannot speculate. That doesn't mean that you can't draw a reasonable inference. And what the Government will suggest to you is, that, ladies and gentlemen, based on the evidence that we've already produced to you, you can draw the reasonable inference that this person is guilty of the offense with which he's

Page 84

1 charged.

Well there's a difference between a speculation and a reasonable inference. But these guys are no slouches. They do this as a business. And there is the business of prosecuting folks and trying to get convictions.

So that they understand that, in those places where they have no evidence, that they've got to fill in the blanks for you. And they will. They'll do it in the form of testimony, like expert testimony.

For instance, if they're talking about a conversation with two people talking about something that seems to be totally innocuous, well, you won't be able to conclude beyond a reasonable doubt from that that those people are talking about drugs, and that they're involved in a conspiracy. So the Government will fill in the blanks for you.

They'll bring in their expert, and their expert will tell you, this is what these guys are talking about. When they say shoes, when they say cars, when they say dogs, they're talking about drugs.

But then you have to buy what the Government is selling, in order to get to the conclusion that the Government wants you to reach.

Oftentimes, in these kind of cases, cases where there's a lot of evidence, cases where there's a lot of documents, cases where there are lots of expert witnesses,

Page 85

cases where the evidence in the case against defendants is sometimes only circumstantial evidence, the technology doesn't help.

And the exhibits don't help. Because what they do, ladies and gentlemen, is they become a smoke screen. They divert your attention from the real evidence in the case, because you can really get overwhelmed by the technology.

When you go back to your deliberations, if you have to take 5,000 pages of paper with you to go through, are you really going to be able to sift through all of that stuff and discern where the truth lies? Maybe. But you may not need to. Because if you listen carefully to the testimony that you hear in this case, if you critically evaluate the testimony that you hear from witnesses in this case, the smoke screens may not work.

And where the Government wants you to guess about things, you may be able to conclude that it's inappropriate to speculate, it's inappropriate to guess, it's more appropriate to follow the Court's instruction and base our verdict only upon the evidence.

Because if you consider only the evidence in this case, you will not be able to find beyond a reasonable doubt that James Morris is guilty of the things of which he's charged in this indictment.

The Government charged him with being involved in a

Page 86

drug conspiracy. And as Mr. Bresnick pointed at Mr. Morris, he said, he's a part of this conspiracy, because there was a bunch of money found, and he had conversations with somebody else in this case about drugs.

Not one single word in a single one of the tape transmissions that you'll hear, is a conversation about drugs. But what you will hear is the Government's expert tell you that what you should conclude is what we tell you to conclude, that it's drug conversation.

There's conversations about buying dogs. There's conversations about some other innocuous things. They'll tell you that those are conversations between James Morris and Alton Coles. But when they do that, when they go back and they put their expert on who talks to you about pen registers and talks to you about intercepting telephone calls and the numbers that these calls come from and go to, you won't find that a single one of the phones that they talk about are phones which were owned or registered to James Morris.

These documents that I have in my hands are the sum of the transcripts of the telephone conversations that the Government intends to rely upon. Of all of the thousands of pages of documents that you will see and be exposed to in this case, these few thin pages constitute the conversations that they say should be sufficient for you to decide beyond a reasonable doubt that this man is guilty of the offenses with

Page 87

which he's charged.

I suggest to you that they will come up deficient, or come up short. There won't be enough. So when there really wasn't enough in this case to make a credible case for the fact that Mr. Morris was involved in a drug conspiracy, the Government charged him with other crimes. Because they didn't want him to get away with anything, they charged him with other serious stuff.

They charged him with making telephone calls. And they said that his telephone calls were telephone calls about illegal stuff. That's the best the Government could come up with, with respect to James Morris. You remember Mr. Bresnick said that the wire was up from May until August of 2005, but that this investigation was an ongoing investigation for at least a year.

And when you have a opportunity to hear the testimony in this case from the special agents and other people involved in this case, you will learn that the investigation went on even longer than that. That it had its inception even earlier than one year.

Mr. Bresnick says that this was a conspiracy which was going on for about seven years. Do you remember 1,200 kilos of cocaine, 600 kilos of crack cocaine, 7 years, zillions of dollars of money exchanging hands. All of those things that he told you about. Now the Government could only know these

Page 88

things, it seems, based upon the investigation that they conducted. Where in all of those years of careful scrutiny and surveillance and interception of telephone conversations, does Mr. Morris fit in?

I'll tell you where. In the last four weeks of the conversations that are being listened to, the Government first claims that Mr. Morris is talking to anybody who's involved in this case.

Now if you're a big shot supplier of drugs, if you're a big shot supplier of narcotics to the kingpin of a huge drug cartel, wouldn't you show up a little sooner? I mean, how's the cartel get its product to market, if you're not providing it?

And if the representation from the Government is that the first time that your name appears anywhere on anyone's conversation, the first time any allegation arises that you had any involvement with anyone who's later charged in the case, is just four or five weeks before the wiretap goes down and the arrests are made on August 10th, 2005, doesn't that mean that all of those 1,200 kilos of cocaine and 600 kilos of crack cocaine couldn't possibly have had anything to do with you? Wouldn't they all have predated your existence?

It seems like they would have. And if that's the case, then why is this guy sitting here? I'll tell you why this guy is sitting here. Because the Government found a lot

of money at 5 Burden Hill Drive in Quinton, New Jersey. And because the Government thinks that, if they find an awful lot of money, that that means that somebody's doing something that

Page 89

4 they shouldn't be doing.

Now if that rule were true, there's lots of people who would get arrested on a daily basis. But we all know that the mere possession of currency isn't an indication that you're involved in criminality.

And, who knows, as you have a opportunity to hear the evidence unfold in this case, you may actually hear an explanation as to where that currency comes from, that belies the representations that have been made to you by the Government about the source of the money.

Now the Government is really good at producing all sorts of technical evidence of criminality. And, as I've said, you'll get to see on these very fine monitors all of the documents and records and other things that they will produce, to show you that they believe people are involved in criminality.

Now the Government has the ability to do other things, too. For instance, the FBI has one of the finest forensic laboratories in the world. They can discern all sorts of things from carpet fibers, and from blood samples, and from swatches of clothing, and from DNA, and from all of those kinds of very sophisticated things.

Page 90

So you would probably imagine that if they dug up \$500,000 and they thought it was the proceeds of drug activity, that they would probably forensically test the money to find out if there was some indication that there was residue of narcotics or something else on the currency.

Maybe the Government will produce something like that during the course of this trial to help you come to the conclusion that this money was something that's illegal.

Because, quite frankly, that's the only thing in this case that seems to suggest that Mr. Morris should be here with you.

Oh, and the Government says that there was also a gun at 5 Burden Hill Drive. And they say that Mr. Morris possessed the gun at 5 Burden Hill Drive. Not one single witness will appear in this case to testify to you that he possessed any weapon.

What you will find out in the course of this trial, because Mr. Bresnick has already told you, is that the gun was legally owned by one of the people who occupied that residence. Now I find it interesting that Mr. Bresnick says, well, even if you own a gun legally, you could use it for unlawful purposes. Well that seems to be sort of axiomatic. Of course that's true. But if you just have it in your house, after you've gone through the process that the state law requires, that is, you've made an application, you're character has been investigated, it's been determined that it's appropriate to

Page 91

give you a permit to possess and/or carry a firearm, and you go out and get yourself one, that shouldn't be held against you, should it?

I think there's something in the Constitution that says something about the right to keep and bear arms. And if you're a single mother who lives at home and you've purchased a weapon to protect your home and your children in case there's an intruder, does it make any sense that you would have a gun that doesn't have any bullets in it?

Because when the intruder breaks in to rape you and to kill your kids, what are you going to do? Hold up your empty gun and say, back up, guy. Of course not. You might as well hold up a picture of a gun.

So folks who do thing that are lawful, folks who comply with the requirements of state and municipal authorities to acquire something like a firearm legally, shouldn't be called to task by the Government, because the Government's involved in the business of prosecuting people.

You've heard a great deal about businesses. Not only are Exxon, and Mobil, and drug cartels businesses, but the Government's a business, as well. And the Government has a hierarchy. And the Government produces different kinds of products. Sometimes the product that the Government produces is prosecution. And, in this case, this group of folks here, are the people who are the company which produces prosecution.

They sell it. They mine it, they sell it, they present it to folks like you, and they hope to develop from it something called convictions. And they're entitled to convictions. When they present you with proof beyond a reasonable doubt that folks have actually committed a crime. But where they're not entitled to convictions are cases in which they ask you to speculate -- cases in which they ask you to fill in the blanks. Cases in which they don't offer you credible evidence that people have been involved in criminality.

Page 92

But where they put people in a courtroom in bunches that hope that if they sling enough mud that it will stick to everybody who just happens to be sitting there.

The Government doesn't expect you to be discerning enough to go through the evidence in this case and find out where the truth lies. I count on it. My client counts on it. We count on you folks to be discerning, to listen to the testimony, not to simply buy what the Government is selling, because you don't have to.

The Government manufactures cheese, but if you don't want Government cheese, you don't have to buy it. You can go to the supermarket and get your own stuff.

You need to do the same thing in this case, ladies and gentlemen, as jurors. You have to be discerning. And it's an intimidating process. When you see the numbers of

Page 93

documents, when you see the list of witnesses. When you see the 127 pages of the exhibit list, that's just the list, ladies and gentlemen, that tells you how many exhibits will be produced in this case.

It is intimidating as can be. When you spend 8 weeks with lawyers, producing witness after witness and document after document, and person after person, and record after record, it's intimidating. The Government knows that.

The Government knows that you can't go through 10,000 pages of documents. They count on you, ladies and gentlemen, not to be discerning. They count on you to do the easy thing. They count on you to take the path of least resistance, and simply say, it would be a lot of work to figure out whether or not the Government's really proven its case beyond a reasonable doubt here. It would be a whole lot simpler just to convict this guy and the others, and let's go home.

You won't do it. I know you won't do it. I know that you folks will listen carefully to the testimony in this case. I know that you will evaluate critically the evidence that's submitted to you, and I know that when you've had a opportunity to do that, you will not be satisfied that the Government has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that James Morris is guilty of the offenses with which he's charged. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Harmelin.

Page 94

MR. HARMLIN: Court's permission. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. This is the first time we've met. My name is Larry Harmlin, I'm a lawyer from Westchester. And I represent Monique Pullins over there, in the black blouse.

Monique Pullins is here because she had the misfortune of falling in love with Alton Coles. And I'm sure nobody here has ever fallen in love with anybody and had it go bad, or have something come up later on that you didn't know originally.

This is Monique Pullins, and she is here presumed innocent, just like everybody else over here. In an opening statement, what we're to do is to provide a roadmap of where the case is going. As much as I might like to get in the face of Mr. Bresnick and stick my finger where he stuck his in Monique's face, I'm not going to do that.

That's showmanship. That's evidence of absolutely nothing. It's something a prosecutor can get away with.

You'll find out whether he can keep his promises as the trial unfolds. I suggest to you that he won't keep his promises.

Interesting that the chart over there has Ms. Pullins right up here at the top of the hit parade. If you landed from Mars, you might think that she's third in command of this organization.

That's not what you're going to find. What you're going to find out is, that she's somebody that fell in love

Page 95

with the wrong person. She's somebody that believed what Mr. Coles asked her to do. She's somebody that believed that he loved her. She loved him. She believed in his love for her.

She's here because she wouldn't do what the rats and muskrats, or whatever animals they are, over at the Detention Center did do.

Having been offered the opportunity to make up some stories about Mr. Coles, she said, I don't know anything, I'm not going to lie. I don't care if I'm facing years, and years, and years in jail. You'll find out what these people are facing, because you're going to hear it from the skunks at the Detention Center.

But this is America. You are presumed innocent, you have a right to your day in Court. And that's exactly what we're doing here. Any of you sitting there with people for 8 weeks, are you responsible for what the person next to you does? I suggest to you that Mr. Warren was right on the money. No. Absolutely not.

Monique is presumed to be innocent as she sits here, and she's going to be innocent, unless and until at the end of 8 weeks, you decide the Government has sustained their burden. I suggest to you that they won't.

She's presumed innocent. Monique has no burden to do anything. I'm sorry, she has the burden to do something, to show up everyday. That's all she has the burden to do.

Nothing else. Additionally, she doesn't have to testify. She, just like any of you, has a Fifth Amendment

Page 96

right to remain silent. If she exercises that right to remain silent, these people can't get up and point their finger again

in 8 weeks and ask her why she didn't testify.

That would cause a problem for the prosecution. So she's presumed innocent, she doesn't have to testify, and the Government and only the Government has the burden of proof. We have no burden. If anybody here can't live with those propositions of the law, kindly raise your hand, and that's why we have alternates.

But my suggestion to you is, and my belief is, that no one would be here unless you already told His Honor in jury selection, you're okay with the presumption of innocense. You're okay with somebody not having to testify in their own behalf. And you're okay with the Government, not somebody charged, having the burden of proof.

That's why it's so important to keep an open mind.

You're going to hear mountains and mountains of testimony. And you're going to see documents, all kinds of evidence, over 8 weeks. Well if you don't keep an open mind, you might as well mail in the verdict today.

Because they get to go first. We have to sit here and listen to all of it. We're not allowed to interrupt in the middle of a bad day and say, oh, excuse me can we put our

Page 97

client on the stand now? We're not allowed to do that. We have to wait until the end of the case.

We can't call witnesses, until they're done with their case. So what are we going to prove, and how are we going to prove it? We're going to prove that she's not guilty of this. We're going to prove that, at the onset of this conspiracy in 1998, Monique Pullins was a 14-year-old school girl.

Do you really think that she was involved in a drug conspiracy at that time? Well they don't have any evidence of that. They have absolutely no evidence of that. But she was his girlfriend, so she's go to be dirty, she's got to be guilty of something.

She's probably running a stash house. No. You can tell, one indication of how weak the case against Monique Pullins is, that the fire-breather over here, was in her face in the first minute of the opening statement.

When the trial's over, I suggest to you you're going to know one thing beyond all doubt, that she is not the second most culpable person in the courtroom. It's a joke that he would do that. The reason he did it is, he knows he's got virtually no evidence. And if he doesn't say something about her before the seventh week, you might say, what the heck is she doing there. So that's why he's doing that, and that's why he's over the top.

Page 98

What we're going to prove is that she's a high school graduate. She graduated from Gratz High School in 2001. And she's had a job ever since she graduated.

She was making \$30 an hour working on the railroad, for over 2 years at the time she got arrested. Now why does she need to be working for him? Now there's the wires. It's my understanding, from the little crib sheet that I had a chance to look at that, they recorded twenty something thousand phone calls in 3 months.

I did the math, and that works out to 286 calls a day. 286 calls a day. If she was helping him with the drug conspiracy, do you think there might be more than a few phone calls? I suggest to you, commonsense tells you, that if he's making 25,000 calls in a 3 month period of time, and she's in a drug conspiracy, you're hear hundreds of phone calls to her.

But you're going to hear the phone calls, and you're going to hear his tone of voice, and you're going to hear the way he talked to her. What we're going to prove is, that she was 21 when she waltzed into a club after coming from another club, and saw him. She met him that night.

They became fast lovers. And they were intimate with each other for four or five months. That's it. Four or five months. He stayed at her house three, four, five nights a week.

But did anybody here ever meet a person -- well, I'll

Page 99

just say a person that they were interested in romantically and find out a day, a week, a month, a year later, well what do you know, the person didn't tell me everything about themselves.

What a shock. Well would that be so shocking that a thirty-something year old guy, meeting a pretty 21-year-old girl, wouldn't tell her everything about his life?

What he showed her was he had a Bentley. He had a Mercedes. He had shows that he put on at clubs. He had a record studio. He had a hip hop promotion company.

She had stars in her eyes. He had bling, he had wealth, and they were physically and emotionally attracted to each other.

Does falling in love with the wrong person make you a criminal? I suggest to you that it does not. I further suggest to you that Monique Pullins is not responsible for the sins of other people. Sins of someone else in the case, don't automatically become the sins of Monique Pullins.

The only evidence in the case really is a bunch of ambiguous phone calls. Stash house. Okay, well, what would you expect to hear from the August 10th raid that made itself into the first minute of Mr. Bresnick's opening statement?

He's over there pointing in her face, yelling and screaming. What did he tell you about the stash house? Oh, the cocaine they found there on August 10th. No. They found no cocaine. Nothing. The kilo wrappers they found there. No,

Page 100

they didn't find any kilo wrappers, they didn't. So what kind of stash house is that?

A stash house, if you listen to him, is a place where they store drugs.

Well what is she, Nostradamus? She knew that the search was coming on August 10th, so she cleared out the stash house? That's preposterous. It's idiotic to suggest that. If that was a stash house, they would have found dope there. They didn't find any dope at all. This was not a stash house, there was no crack, there was no cocaine. It was just not what they claim it was.

And that's why I suggest to you they can't sustain their burden. They can't prove everything they say. So how are we going to raise a reasonable doubt? We're going to raise the reasonable doubt by cross-examination of the witnesses.

We're going to raise a reasonable doubt by calling character witnesses on her behalf. In Federal Court, you're allowed to call witnesses that can testify to the good character of somebody for being a law abiding citizen.

Monique Pullins has never been in trouble with the law in her life. Good character and good character evidence alone is enough to raise a reasonable doubt. And I suggest to you, you will hear good character testimony from Monique Pullins' witnesses.

We will raise a reasonable doubt, because the

Page 101

Government cannot prove that she's involved in selling drugs.

There's not a single witness that's going to come in here and say Monique sold him drugs.

There's not a single witness who's going to say there were drugs in her house on August 10th, 2005. There's no evidence that, when she got rid of the gun, at Mr. Coles suggestion, that she knew it had anything at all to do with drugs.

She is not charged with possessing a firearm without a license. It's very important to understand that, because there is a charge in Pennsylvania called, possession of a firearm without a license.

It's very simple to prove. You got to prove the person had a gun in their possession, and they didn't have a license. Well this is a far different crime. This is possessing of a gun that's been used in a drug conspiracy to further the aims of the drug conspiracy.

There isn't going to be any evidence for that. And that's why that charge is unprovable. There's no physical evidence. There's no fingerprints of Monique Pullins, for example, on the digital scale. They aren't even going to be able to prove she even knew it was there. He's there three, four nights a week, we don't know what he might bring there or he might leave there.

But physical evidence is fingerprint evidence. If

Page 102

she touched the digital scale, weighing up dope, her fingerprints would be all over it. And shame on them, if they didn't test the digital scale for fingerprints.

They're the ones with the burden of proof. Not the defendant. So there's no physical evidence, there's no witness that's going to say Monique sold them drugs.

There's no evidence that there was drugs in the house on August 10th when they searched the place. Falling in love with the wrong person, doesn't make you a bad person.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Your Honor. May I approach?
THE COURT: Yes, indeed.

MR. SMITH: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, good afternoon. You may have forgotten by now, it's so late in the day, my name is Ronald Smith, and I represent Asya Richardson.

Asya can you stand up for a second, please? Take a good close look at her. Because during the next weeks and months you're going to hear very little about her, you're going to see very little about her in this case.

That's why I want you to take a good look at her right now. It's customary, at this point in time, for defense counsel to say a few words about his case. It's late in the day, I'm not going to belabor it. You've already heard the fine arguments by my colleagues here.

Just let me go over a few things here, let me point out a few things which you may have forgotten already, which

Page 103

the Judge pointed out earlier this morning and early this afternoon. Remember, there are certain guideposts, guideposts that you have to remember when you're watching a case. Guideposts such as, remember, that it's not the questions that we ask, it's not the showmanship that we go through, it's the evidence that comes out of the witness's mouths that testify from the witness stand right there. That's the evidence.

Not the questions, not the showmanship, not the histrionics. Listen to the words that the witnesses give you during the course of this case.

Because it's from that evidence, from the witnesses' testimony that's either going to acquit or convict my client.

And, remember, when you listen to these words, when you listen to these words, there's certain other things you have to remember. That we do not have the burden of proof here.

These gentlemen over here, they have the burden of proof. Well, burden of proof of what? They have the burden of proof of proving my client, my client, Asya Richardson here, guilty of all elements, of all the crimes charged against her. So remember that. That's very, very important. We can sit here and do nothing.

Our only task is under the Constitution, is to tell the United States Government, prove your case against us. And as she sits here, and she listens to the evidence and you listen to the evidence, remember here, and this is very, very

Page 104

important, but sometimes we forget about this. That my client sits here cloaked with the presumption of innocense. Now what does that mean? Is that something she's wearing on top of her, on top of her blouse? No, it's an invisible cloak. It's a cloak of presumption of innocense.

And you have to remember, this cloak remains about her throughout the entire case for the next few weeks, the next few months. This cloak remains until you hear our final argument, the Judge gives you his instructions, you go back in the room and you deliberate.

And it's up to the United States Government to remove this cloak. And they have to remove it, the burden of proof beyond a reasonable doubt. I'm sure you're going to hear those words ad nauseam. Now and perhaps at the end of the case.

You will determine, when you sift through this evidence and you wait to see have they proven all elements of the charges of the crime against my client beyond that reasonable doubt. And I will submit to you at the end of this case, they will have not.

Now you're looking up at this picture here, of this organizational chart here. Which is important here. Because as I said, you came in here, as my colleagues said, if you just landed from Mars, you would think that Mr. Coles is the general. The two gentlemen to his left and right are the colonels. And my client that's smiling there in her, I guess,

Page 105

what the Government would tell you is a mug shot, she's at least a major in this organization, and in charge of all these little -- these characters below here. And there she is in her mug shot. Well the mug shot, I would submit to you, that looks an awful lot like the driver's license here -- photo here, with the blue background here.

So it's not a mug shot. All it is, is a driver's license photo. So I would submit to you, as you look at this organizational chart, don't get caught up in the trap, and say, well, it was a mug shot and all that. All it is a picture of what they purport to show that my client, at least -- that she's one of the higher ups in this organization.

Once again, they've made certain promises to you.

Determine whether or not they have kept their promises to you.

Now I'm going to ask you for a promise, too. As my colleague pointed out to you. A promise that, I want you to as you listen to the evidence during the next month or so, the promise I want from you is to pay close attention to it, and do not leave your commonsense outside of this courtroom when you listen to this evidence.

You're not robots here, you're human beings. Listen to this evidence, listen to it with the commonsense that you didn't check in at the door when you came through that door there. Listen to this evidence and determine whether or not they have removed the cloak of presumption of innocense against

Page 106

my client. Now the promise I will give to you -- I'm going to give you two promises. One, that my final speech to you at the end of this case is going to be a little bit longer than it is today, because it is late in the day, I'll make that one promise to you.

And the second promise I'm going to make to you is, even though my client sits here and doesn't have to do a darn thing and say, Government, prove the case against me, the promise I'm going to make to you and I'm telling them right now, she will get up there and testify. She will get up there and testify and tell you exactly what the relationship was with Alton Coles, and what responsibility and involvement she had, if any, with the charges.

Now, remember, when you look at all this evidence and you look at the end of this case, you're going to come up to a determination that, what this is against my client, my client there, with the mug shot from her driver's photo, is nothing but prosecutorial overreaching. And I would respectfully submit to you, at the end of this case, you will come back and give a verdict of not guilty against my client.

Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Mr. Hetznecker.

MR. HETZNECKER: Thank you. Ms. Thompson, gentlemen.

I have the unenviable task of going last. Last man standing.

And it's late in the day, and I hope that you don't hold it

Page 107

against me, but I'm going to talk for a few minutes. Because I think it's very important that you listen to what I have to say on behalf of Thais Thompson.

I also what to thank you. A lot of what my colleagues have said, I may repeat. Don't hold that against me. As the Judge will instruct you at the end of this case, you are to consider the evidence against each and every individual separately, and apart, and distinctly. So when you evaluate the evidence that the Government puts on against Thais Thompson, hold them to their burden. The burden that everyone's talked about in detail. But I will mention, and I will talk about it in a moment.

I, too, want to thank you. I know it's going to be a long and arduous journey for all of us. But we thank you for your commitment in this case. Your oath, your obvious decision to be open-minded in this case. To not avoid your duty, but to sit here and listen to the evidence in this very important case.

And I know I say that on behalf of everybody here.

And I want to say that, as well. I know Mr. McMahon said it,
but I want to say it, as well. Because I think sitting as a
juror is probably the most significant and compelling role you
can have as a citizen. It's more important than voting.

Because you collectively will decide my client's future. You collectively will decide the evidence in this

Page 108

case. You will determine whether or not the law, as His Honor, Judge Surrick, gives you as applied to the facts is the truth.

Now what is evidence? Evidence is what you hear from the witness stand and what you believe. And if you believe that the Government overreaches, as other counsel has mentioned, to an extent that they would charge someone who was not involved in any drug conspiracy, not involved in any drug activity, charge someone in an effort to squeeze them, then your belief will be affirmed, if you believe that. If you don't, it will be shattered.

Let's look at this hierarchy of an organization that the Government puts up there. And it's been mentioned before, but it's interesting that it's been sitting here throughout the day.

Hour after hour. And in an attempt, I think the Government wants to crystalize in your minds, the idea that this is a structure. This is a hierarchy. That Thais Thompson isn't anything other than the girlfriend, the paramour, the mother of James Morris' three children. Because that's what she is.

Mr. Bresnick didn't tell you that. He also didn't tell you that she's a licensed nurse. That the home on Burden Hill Road is her mother's and purchased by her mother.

That she cares for those three children and that James Morris is back and forth at that place over the years.

22.

Page 109

He didn't tell you any of that. What he told you is, from the very beginning, he mentioned that there was a firearm, in an effort to scare you, in an effort to intimidate you, in an effort to focus -- have you focus on things that are not relevant to the truth. That a firearm found in her purse upstairs, which she admits is her's, and which, by the way, she had a permit issued in 2000 for. Because she is a single mother, as Mr. Powell said. She was living alone from time-to-time and caring for those 3 children, 8, 7 and 17 months. So she had a firearm and she admitted that.

But there's no evidence that the Government will present to establish that she's involved in a drug stash house. That that location at 5 North Burden Hill Road is anything other than her home, purchased by her parents, for her and her children.

That's the truth. My name is Paul Hetznecker, you're not going to hear much from me throughout this trial, because, as other counsel has said, there's going to be very little evidence against Thais Thompson.

And I hope that my silence speaks volumes, as you sit here and listen to the evidence in this case. Because the evidence will not be that she was involved in drug trafficking, that she conspired to do any of that. In fact, they don't charge her with that. Here's what they do.

They call her to a Grand Jury and they want to ask

Page 110

her questions, and they do ask her questions. And I want you to look very carefully at the language that's used in the Government's indictment to allege that she perjured herself.

Now you heard His Honor give you very specific instructions about what perjury is. A false statement that's material under oath. And you look at Mr. Bresnick's questions of her during the course of the Grand Jury testimony.

They brought her there to squeeze her. Because they believed she knew something about James Morris she didn't know. And when she told them she didn't know, they weren't satisfied with that. August 10th, 2005, there's a search warrant executed. \$560,000 is found in the home. She admits to having the gun. It's my gun, I have a permit.

Do they arrest her? They find drugs in a car outside. Do they charge her? No. Do they have any surveillance on her, any belief that she's involved in anything? In fact, you'll hear the agent say, because I'll cross-examine the agent, they question her, no they had no information that she was involved in any criminal activity.

None. None. So why does she sit here today? You heard co-counsel talk about the mechanism that the Government uses. I want you to look very carefully at the way this prosecution was structured. They don't charge her on August 11th, they don't charge her on August the 12th. They don't charge her on August 15th, or September, or October, or

Page 111

1 November, or December.

They call her to a Grand Jury, and they try to squeeze her. And when they're not happy with what she says, they call it a lie. And they charge her with perjury. Not with operating a stash house. Not with possessing a gun in furtherance of a drug trafficking offense. No. They don't charge her with those. They charge her with perjury.

Because the mechanism that the Government uses in prosecuting this case is to squeeze, as they had done with those cooperators that are facing life in jail.

But she can't tell them what they want her to tell them, because she doesn't know. She tells them where the money came from. They're not happy about it. So what do they do? They subpoens her family to the Grand Jury. And they call them to the Grand Jury. Are they charged with perjury? No.

Who's charged with perjury? James Morris's girlfriend. Long time girlfriend, mother of his children. Charged with perjury. Not with stash house, not with accessory after the fact. Not with possession of a weapon in a drug trafficking crime. None of that happens when they charge her.

So in the fifth superceding indictment, five superceding indictments, and you heard co-counsel mention what that means, all of a sudden they charge her with these other offenses. And it's all linked, according to their theory, to this so-called perjury before the Grand Jury.

Page 112

Let's see if we get her in a lie, charge her with perjury, and we go from there. And, then, maybe she'll say something about James Morris she doesn't know. She doesn't know. And we'll call it a lie. And then, put her in front of the jury with everyone else and throw her up on a hierarchy of some sort of imagined drug organization, and there she is. Lieutenant, major, I don't know what they're claiming she is, but there she is. But Mr. Bresnick wanted to scream and shout about the gun found in her pocketbook. A gun that a single mother has a permit to hold, because she lived in a semi-rural area with three children, and she's alone at night.

Very often, all by herself, for months on end.

Guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Not guilty. Not guilty.

That's this case. It's frightening to think this is how we function. That we squeeze individuals who are facing life in jail to testify and cooperate.

That's what they're doing. And then, when they have someone that they can't squeeze, because she doesn't know, they charge her with a lie. You look at Mr. Bresnick's questions. You look very carefully at Mr. Bresnick's questions of Thais Thompson in the Grand Jury. We don't parse words. She's charged with perjury. You see whether or not she perjures herself on a material statement.

I submit to you, it's not there. He even said it in his opening. If you look very carefully, he said to you,

Page 113

ladies and gentlemen, this morning, do you know whether or not Mr. Morris had a bank account at a bank? Not a credit union, a bank.

And that's the basis of it. They're going to show you evidence that he had an account at a credit union. We don't parse language here. Either it's perjury, or its not. And if it's not, it's not guilty.

Because she wasn't charged with any of the other charges until the fifth superceding indictment, when they couldn't squeeze something out of her she didn't have. Now co-counsel had mentioned this, but I'm going to talk about it a little bit, and then I'll come back in closing.

Because you're not going to hear from me, probably for weeks.

You'll hear from me on the cross-examination of the agents on the Burden Hill Road, you're going to hear from me. But for weeks on end, you're going to hear tapes, you're going to hear evidence that has nothing to do with this young lady, mother of three children and a nurse.

Yeah, she fell in love with James Morris. You decide the case against James Morris separately. On July 31st, 2005, there's a phone call to that house from Alton Coles and she says, he's not here. That's their case. That's their case. That was their case in August, September, October, November, December. All the way through, until he subpoenaed her to the

Page 114

Grand Jury. That was their case. \$560,000, and that's it. She offers an explanation and they try to disprove it and they can't.

So they don't charge her with perjury initially on that. They charge her with perjury on something else. The credit union, the bank that Mr. Bresnick asks her about. The bank.

Look very carefully at the evidence in this case.

Hold them to their burden. The burden on the Government and the presumption of innocense is two guideposts. I call them path markers. Markers on this journey. What you're going to hear is a story from witnesses.

The Government has, as people have mentioned, and I'm going to say it again, all the resources, agents, experts, fingerprint experts. All the resources available to them in prosecuting this case against Thais Thompson. You see whether or not those experts have any clear bearing against the case against Thais Thompson. What she has is, she has the presumption of innocence, and you. You, collectively. That's what she has. That's the protection that's afforded her.

Mr. Warren said, look at the resources the Government has, it's only Coles and Chris Warren. I would modify it.

It's the Government against the presumption of innocense and you. Because you, collectively, hold my client's future in your hands.

Page 115

And that path marker that guides your journey in this case. That's the path marker. The other one is the burden on the Government to prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

They have to prove each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt. Perjury, accessory after the fact.

924(c), possession of a gun in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime? A gun purchased in 2000. A gun she admits to that's in her handbag upstairs? A gun she's not charged with, until like a year and a half later? Come on.

Fire and brimstone? Yeah, I'm angry. Darn right I'm angry. Because don't equate power with justice. Just because they have the power to charge someone, they have the power to subpoena them into the Grand Jury --

THE COURT: Mr. Hetznecker, this is an opening statement.

MR. HETZNECKER: Yes, Your Honor. And so was Mr. Bresnick. But I will confine my remarks. Keep your eyes firmly fixed on those two guideposts, or path marks. Presumption of innocense and the burden on the Government to prove it's case beyond a reasonable doubt.

And when you've heard all the evidence in this case, listened to all the witnesses, I hope that you will come to the only just and fair conclusion with respect to Thais Thompson.

And that is, she is not guilty of the charges in this case.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Page 116

THE COURT: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen it's a little bit after 4:30. We're going to recess for the day. And I'm going to ask you to be back tomorrow at 9:15, if you will.

Ladies and gentlemen, again, I'm going to give you these cautionary instructions every time you leave the jury Don't get outside input in this matter. Don't talk to anybody about the case. Don't let anyone talk to you. do any independent investigation.

Take the matter as it's presented here. We'll see you tomorrow at 9:15, and we'll begin again promptly.

(End of Requested Portion 4:33:50)

(Court adjourned)

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

CERTIFICATION

I, Josette Jones, court approved transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

DATE

19

20

21

22

23

JOSETTE JONES

DOMAN TRANSCRIBING AND RECORDING

SERVICES